

THE AMERICAN ✠ CHURCH ✠ MONTHLY

Selden Peabody Delany, D.D., Editor

January, 1922

Vol. 10 No. 5

Editorial Comment	- - - -	371
A Notable Achievement—Compassion—The Conference of Modern Churchmen—A Study in Contrasts—Do We Need Another Seminary?—Why Not Rome?		
Mr. Shaw's Heaven	- - - -	380
<i>The Bishop of Southern Florida</i>		
Psychonalysis and Christianity	- - - -	387
<i>Cyril E. Hudson</i>		
Anglican Modernism	- - - -	405
<i>Frederick Sherman Arnold</i>		
The Book of the Revelation	- - - -	414
<i>Charles Carroll Edmunds</i>		
Vocations of the Priesthood	- - - -	420
<i>Robert Spencer Rayson</i>		
The Spiritual Value of Holy Communion	- - - -	428
<i>Alanson Q. Bailey</i>		
Book Reviews	- - - -	435
Books Received	- - - -	445

Entered as second-class matter at the Post Office, New Brunswick, N. J., under act of March 3, 1879.

Published by the TEMPLE PUBLISHING CO., 1 and 3 Peace Street
New Brunswick, New Jersey

EDWIN S. GORHAM, Business Manager
11 West 45th Street, New York, N. Y.

LONGMANS' NEW BOOKS

THE SACRAMENTS

By the Rev. FRANCIS J. HALL, D.D., Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the General Theological Seminary, New York City. Being Volume IX of Dogmatic Theology, to be completed in ten volumes. Crown 8vo. \$2.25 net

"This volume is very closely related to the previous one; for the Church, its ministry and its sacraments make up in inter-connected order one appointed working system of the new covenant—based, indeed, upon Christ's redemption, but constituting the immediate machinery of the quickening, saving and sanctifying dispensation of grace through which the benefits of Christ's mediation are conveyed to us."—*From the Preface.*

This series of ten volumes, each complete in itself, is designed to constitute a connected treatment of the entire range of Catholic Doctrine. Each, \$2.25 net.

- | | |
|---|--|
| I. Introduction. | VII. The Passion and Exaltation of Christ. |
| II. Authority, Ecclesiastical and Biblical. | VIII. The Church and the Sacramental System. |
| III. The Being and Attributes of God. | IX. The Sacraments. |
| IV. The Trinity. | X. Eschatology: Indexes. |
| V. Creation and Man. | |
| VI. The Incarnation. | |

[Ready 1923]

THE COMFORT OF THE CATHOLIC FAITH

By the Rev. FRANK M. CLENDENIN, D.D. Author of "Idols by the Sea," and Other Essays. 12mo. \$1.50 net.

WHO ARE MEMBERS OF THE CHURCH?

By DARWELL STONE, D.D., Principal of Pusey House, and F. W. PULLER, M.A., of the Society of St. John the Evangelist. Crown 8vo. *Paper Covers.* \$0.40 net.

This new Pusey House Paper is an examination of the statement made by the Lambeth Conference of 1920 as the foundation of its "Appeal to all Christian People," that all who believe in our Lord Jesus Christ and have been baptized into the name of the Holy Trinity share membership in the Universal Church, which is the Body of Christ.

CHRISTIAN PHILOSOPHY

Discussed under the three-fold Heading of Absolute Values, Creative Evolution and Religion. By Rev. Canon J. GURNHILL, B.A. 8vo. [In the Press]

This volume may be regarded as a continuation and further development of the Author's previous contributions to the study of spiritual philosophy.

LOTZE'S THEORY OF REALITY

By the Rev. E. E. THOMAS, M.A., late Fellow of the University of Wales; Curate of All Saints', Llanllwchaearn. 8vo. \$5.00 net

This work aims at giving a detailed and critical exposition of Lotze's metaphysics.

MEN OF MIGHT: Studies of Great Characters

By A. C. BENSON, C.V.O., LL.D., Master of Magdalene College, Cambridge; and H. F. W. TATHAM, M.A. *With Portraits.* Crown 8vo. \$2.25 net.

CONTENTS: Socrates, Mahomet, St. Bernard, Savonarola, Michael Angelo, Carlo Borromeo, Fénelon, John Wesley, George Washington, Henry Martyn, Dr. Arnold, Livingstone, General Gordon, Father Damien.

"Models of what such compositions should be; full of incident and anecdote, with the right note of enthusiasm. It is a long time since we have seen a better book for youngsters."—*The Guardian.*

LONGMANS, GREEN & CO., Publishers

FOURTH AVE. and THIRTIETH ST., NEW YORK

Please mention THE AMERICAN CHURCH MONTHLY when answering Advertisements

FOR 1922

The Living Church Annual and Churchman's Year Book

formerly two publications, will appear as one in a consolidated volume. It will therefore be the residuary of the three Church Almanacs that were formerly made.

The contents include the usual varied material which goes to make up a complete Church Almanac. The Annual Cyclopedia for 1921 is unusually complete. The

PORTRAITS OF BISHOPS

include all those consecrated within the year. The **GENERAL, DIOCESAN AND PAROCHIAL**

information is carefully corrected. The

LECTIONARY

is that set forth by the Joint Commission for use during 1922. Owing to delays caused by the Printers' Strike, publication is deferred to

the Last of December

The same reason also compels a slight increase in price, as follows:

Paper, \$1.00. Cloth, \$1.25

Postage east of Colorado, about 15 cts.

NOW READY

The Desk Kalendar

Comprising the Kalendar and Lectionary pages from the above

Price 25 cts. Postage 2 cts.

NEW YORK

For Sale by EDWIN S. GORHAM, 11 West 45th Street

MILWAUKEE

MOREHOUSE PUBLISHING COMPANY

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS NUMBER

The Rt. Rev. Cameron Mann, D.D., is the Bishop of Southern Florida.

The Rev. Cyril E. Hudson is an English priest who has written frequently for English periodicals on the New Psychology. He is on the staff of St. John the Divine, Kennington, London, England.

The Rev. Frederick Sherman Arnold lives in Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

The Rev. Charles Carroll Edmunds is Professor of the Literature and Interpretation of the New Testament in the General Theological Seminary.

Robert Spencer Rayson, M.A., is Professor of English in Upper Canada College, Toronto, Ontario.

The Rev. Alanson Q. Bailey is the Rector of Christ Church, Shrewsbury, N. J.

The American Church Monthly

*A Magazine of comment, criticism and review dealing
with questions confronting the Anglican Communion
and more especially the Church in the United States*

TEMPLE PUBLISHING CORPORATION

1-3 Peace St., New Brunswick, N. J.

President: GEORGE A. ARMOUR, Princeton, N. J.

Vice-President: HON. WILLIAM J. TULLY, Corning, N. Y.

Secretary: THE REV. CHARLES C. EDMUNDS, D.D., 6 Chelsea Square, New York

Treasurer: HALEY FISKE, 1 Madison Avenue, New York

Three Dollars a Year

Canadian subscription, \$3.25 a Year

Twenty-five Cents a Copy

Foreign subscription, \$3.50 a Year

Volume X

JANUARY, 1922

Number 5

EDITORIAL COMMENT

A Notable Achievement

ONE of the most thorough and scholarly treatises on theology ever produced within the Anglican part of the Church is now nearing completion. We refer to the ten volume work on Dogmatic Theology by the Rev. Dr. Francis J. Hall, Professor of Dogmatic Theology in the General Theological Seminary. The ninth volume on The Sacraments has just appeared, and the concluding volume on Eschatology is announced for 1922. We heartily congratulate Dr. Hall on being able to bequeath to posterity as the fruit of his life-work so valuable an heritage.

We hope that the title "Dogmatic Theology" and the fact that the work fills ten volumes will not discourage churchmen from buying and reading it. Unfortunately as a result of the Puritan and Protestant strain in our temperaments many of us instinctively

shrink from anything dogmatic. It has always been a favorite Protestant dogma that we must not accept dogma. But dogma means nothing more than teaching, and dogmatic theology is simply the scientific thinking about religion that is based on the authoritative teachings of the Catholic Church. If we want to think intelligently about our religion, dogmatic theology is exactly what we need. Furthermore it causes intense pain to most Americans to give up money for a book. The purchase of a ten volume work would seem like mortgaging their home. We read fewer books proportionately to our population than any civilized nation in the world. Magazines and newspapers are our mental pabulum.

Nevertheless we make bold to advise every intelligent layman to save a little money and gain possession of this comprehensive work on theology. It should be a most useful work to refer to whenever one wishes to know just what the Catholic Church teaches on any subject. One may read something or hear a statement in a sermon or be asked a question that makes one eager to know what the Church teaches about baptismal regeneration, or the gift received in confirmation, or the real presence in the Eucharist, or transubstantiation, or the anointing of the sick. One can easily look up the matter in this work of Dr. Hall's with the assurance that he will be told what the Church teaches rather than the interesting speculation of some wild heretic. The theological conclusions therein set forth are orthodox and Catholic, and yet thoroughly in harmony with our Anglican formularies.

The clergy, too, will find this *Summa* immensely valuable in their work of teaching the faith of the Church to their people. Whatever subject they may intend to preach upon, they should refer to these volumes and make sure that their teachings are coherent and sound and in accord with the faith which they have been solemnly commissioned to teach. The clergy were not ordained to preach their own opinions, however striking they may think them to be, but the revealed truth that God has committed to the Church. Too often, alas! the hungry people look up to the preacher in the pulpit, and are not fed!

We rejoice to learn that after this treatise has been completed, Dr. Hall, with the collaboration of Dr. F. H. Hallock of the Seabury Divinity School, is to bring out a similar work on Moral

Theology. That such a work is greatly needed was declared in one of the pronouncements of the Bishops at the last Lambeth Conference.

Compassion

WHEN our Lord mingled with the multitudes He was moved with compassion. Some people say it was because He was God. How do we know it was not because He was perfect man? He knew what was in man, not because as God He could read their minds, but because as man He fully shared the experiences of our human nature.

How is it with us in our attitude to the multitudes? It is easy to assume a superior pose and look upon them with contempt and scorn. It is easy to become disgusted with the masses of our fellow citizens and refer to them as did the Prussian, Frederick the Great, as "that damned race." If we take that attitude, we can hardly be said to be imitators of Christ.

How can we avoid being filled with boundless compassion for our fellow human beings? As we look into the faces of the people that throng the streets of any large city, we realize vividly how everyone has his troubles. There is no one who does not hide within his soul a harassing or painful experience. Those of a buoyant temperament may be able to conceal it under a happy or a courageous countenance; but in most cases the underlying sorrow is plainly discernible in the expression of the eyes or the droop of the lips. How manifold are the miseries of our fellow men! Bad teeth, defective eyesight, dullness of hearing, an unfortunate quality of voice, lameness, fallen arches, indigestion, feeble-mindedness, poverty, financial difficulties, family unhappiness, loneliness, unrequited love, childlessness, disappointment in children, uncongenial work, persecution, social unpopularity, repressed complexes, phobias, obsessions, broken hearts—one could fill pages with the ailments of humanity!

If only we could see within people's hearts, what compassion we should have for them! How we should sympathize with them! How easy it is to love people when we know their inner struggles and perplexities! There is a pathetic side to every human being, if we but take the trouble to look for it. That is the meaning of

the compassion of our Lord. That is the meaning of the obligation of Christian charity toward our neighbors which rests upon every follower of Christ.

The Conference of Modern Churchmen

NO one would wish to deny the right of Anglican Modernists to assemble in conference, as they did at Girton, and discuss "Christ and the Creeds." If they came to the conclusion that they could no longer accept the credal statements on the Incarnation, as professed since the fourth century by all parts of the Catholic Church, they were quite within their rights. Nobody should ever be compelled to believe anything against his will. Every individual should be permitted to frame his own creed, if he does not like the creed of the Church. These are truisms which must be obvious to all.

When, however, ordained ministers of the Anglican Establishment throw over the historic creeds of the Church on the ground that they are meaningless to us today because couched in the terms of fourth century metaphysics, and propose substituting for them a confession of personal devotion to our Lord as "the Supreme Revealer of the Love of God, and as the Saviour of the world," then we begin to wonder. We ask ourselves whether such men have a right to remain official teachers of the Church, and gain their livelihood by promulgating a faith in which they have ceased to believe. From the published report of the Girton Conference, it is evident that some of the appointed speakers were uncomfortably suspicious of the inconsistency of their position.

However much Anglo-Catholics may be disliked in some quarters for their extreme practices, their worst enemies cannot accuse them of denying the fundamentals of the Faith, or of making a disingenuous use of the creeds. They believe in Jesus Christ, as incarnate God, as Catholics of all kinds have always believed in Him. There are no Anglo-Catholic priests who would remain in the ministry or in the Church so much as a day after they had ceased thus to believe in Him. They would break stones for a living, or dig ditches, or haul gravel; but they would not stand at the altars of the Church nor preach from her pulpits.

A Study in Contrasts

A STRANGER in a town not far distant from the metropolis set out one Sunday evening to attend church. It chanced that the first place of worship he came to was Roman Catholic—large, imposing, built of massive, rough-hewn gray stones. He entered the vestibule and saw from a service list that Vespers and Benediction were appointed for that evening at eight. He was disappointed that there was not to be a sermon, but the Gregorian chant of the Vesper Psalms was sufficiently devotional to induce him to go in.

He found a church comfortably full of devout worshippers, many of them men, and a noticeable number of young people and children with their parents. Perhaps there were four hundred in the congregation. What impressed him most was a row of about forty boys, ranging in age from seven to fifteen, seated inside the altar rail with their backs to the congregation and facing the altar. They were vested in black cassocks and white cottas. They were a well-behaved, healthy-looking lot of boys—the future business men, aldermen, lawyers, policemen and priests of the town. Never did he see boys more attentive and devout and motionless in church.

At Benediction the altar was glorious—a blaze of candle-light against a background of white and gold. The congregation of simple folk entered heartily into this impressive devotion. They really thought that Jesus was there in the Monstrance, giving them His blessing as He blessed His apostles before His Ascension into heaven. And Mary was there, too, spending the evening with them as they said their rosaries. It was all over at twenty minutes to nine, and the stranger was about to return to his hotel, when he noticed another church on the opposite corner. He approached the bulletin board and learned that it was a Presbyterian church, and the pastor was preaching on the subject, "A Warless World." As it was yet early, the stranger decided he would visit this church also, and found as he expected that the pastor was still preaching—or rather reading his sermon.

The stranger was surprised at the small number of people who were eager to hear about "A Warless World." He counted fifty-five in the pews, mostly skirting the rear seats of the amphitheatre. He noted that there were no boys present, and only two little girls—one fast asleep on her mother's shoulder. Could it be that the

boys of that congregation were not interested to hear about a warless world, or had they lost interest in religion? The only touch of color in the auditorium was a silk American flag draped about the pulpit. There was no symbol or picture to indicate that this was a Christian church, or a temple of worship. Jesus Christ was not mentioned by the preacher—he did not even utter the name of God. His sermon was concerned chiefly with the Washington Conference and the mysteries of international politics. The stranger thought the preacher would never stop. He was still preaching at a quarter past nine, when the stranger went out into the night under God's stars.

Do We Need Another Seminary?

CERTAINLY not, if the question is concerned with numbers and patronage. There are ten seminaries east of the Mississippi (not counting several somewhat anomalous institutions) and not one of them is filled. It might be statesmanlike to combine some of these existing institutions into five or six. But of these ten seminaries practically all are of one type, or rapidly being reduced to that type. They exist primarily for the academic study of theology, with reference particularly to modern scholarship and controversies. They possess learned and admirable Faculties. There is a wide range of subjects. Almost everything is taught except the duties of the priest in the cure of souls and the development of the spiritual life and the formation of Christian character. The students are being prepared to deal with many varieties of objectors, but not with the overwhelming number of people who are asking now as of old, "what must I do to be saved?" Nor are they taught how to help their people grow in grace and in the knowledge of our Lord Jesus Christ.

All that candidates for the priesthood need to know about biblical criticism could be given in half a dozen lectures or less. What is sorely needed is training in the devotional knowledge and use of the New Testament and portions of the Old Testament. There should be less time devoted in Church History to the papal claims and more to the study of the witness of the history of the Church to the success of Catholic truth and the failure of revolts from that norm; the inspiring lives of the saints, confessors, and mar-

tyrs; and the thrilling movements which have raised up men who have given up all for Christ. All the deeper concerns of the soul—the sense of the holiness of God, the realization of the seriousness of sin against His known will, the way to forgiveness, the development of humility and all the Christian virtues—need to be experienced and studied, so that the priest will long to give to others what he has experienced himself.

Men have often expressed themselves disappointed at the conclusion of a three years' seminary course that they have been only partially and very imperfectly prepared for the responsible work that devolves upon them immediately after ordination. They have an academic smattering of a few subjects, an elementary acquaintance with some of the religious or philosophical fads of the moment, a little information about destructive criticism. But they do not know what to say or do for the sick, the sinful, and the sad. They cannot build up souls in the spiritual life, for they have not been trained themselves nor taught self-discipline. They are ready to accept positions on commissions, to become professors, to deal with men in the masses, but not in the Mass. There are many who are longing for a devotional insight into Holy Scripture, with criticism and mere exegesis made subordinate. They wish to be taught to apply doctrine directly to life, to feel the inspiration of the history of the Catholic Church, to be able to teach people how to bear witness to God and His Revelation, instead of preaching to them only a barren apologetic. Above all many wish to be trained in meditation and the life of holiness, so that as they go forth they may show forth God's praise "not only with their lips but in their lives."

The problem of restlessness of the clergy would be largely met, if the younger clergy had been helped to feel the inestimable privilege and joy of saving and helping individual souls; and the Bishops would find a different type of ordinands emerging from such a seminary. Where there is the growing demand for such training, the provision of the opportunity is sure to come.

Why Not Rome?

MANY Roman Catholics are mystified that so many of our clergy and laity, who believe in and practice the Catholic faith, should be content to remain in the Anglican fold—rather than make their

submission to Rome. They accuse us of staying where we are from all sorts of motives: either we are seeking the loaves and fishes (not very plentiful, it must be admitted), or we are intellectually dishonest in adhering to an inconsistent position, or we are incurably illogical, or we are ignorant of ecclesiastical history, or we are just plain stubborn. Many Broad Churchmen would shout a hearty *amen* to all of these accusations.

They cannot seem to understand that we stay where we are because we believe it is the will of God. We are convinced that God has laid upon us a tremendously difficult task at a perilous post. He has commissioned us to bring back all Anglicans to the Catholic Faith. He has encouraged us with many signs of His approval and the co-operation of the Holy Spirit. That being the case, we feel that it would be treacherous and cowardly for us to run away from our post.

Bishop Charles Gore has expressed this feeling admirably in the memorable address which he delivered at the great meeting of the English Church Union in Birmingham on the eve of the recent Church Congress. No man understands better than Bishop Gore the anxieties which beset Anglo-Catholics in England at the present juncture, and yet he believes in standing firm. We quote from the report of his address in the *Church Times* of October 14, 1921.

Meanwhile, there is no doubt a great strain on people's patience and endurance. I am myself not capable of being a Roman Catholic, so that the pressure of that question is not on me or my conscience. I am quite sure that the Roman Catholic Church requires of any of its members adhesion to propositions which I am certain are unauthorized, untrue, and unhistorical. I would appeal to you in the sense in which an older man, an old man, can make an appeal which perhaps a young man could not. I mean my experience goes back further, How what—to use a technical term in its technical sense—we call Catholicism, how Catholicism stood in the English Church when I was young I remember; how it stands in the Church of England today I more or less know. It has many faults; but compare the picture as I remember it fifty years ago or more with the condition of things now. Compare Birmingham as it was fifty years ago with Birmingham as it is now. Think of the manifold growths on the Catholic basis which have been allowed and blessed and made fruitful. And I say to any disquieted person this: I cannot understand how anyone who has had this experience can doubt not merely that the blessing of God has been with us—the blessing of God is with many enterprises different from

ours—but I cannot understand how you can doubt that there is a purpose of God for Catholicism, a purpose of God moving through extraordinary vicissitudes and dangers towards the re-establishment among us and by our help of the Catholic religion in England. And it is the privilege not of the clergy only, but of every one of us, to take part in that restoration, and there is no act by which you can so weaken that movement as the act of seceding to another community. That is why I cannot help looking towards anyone whose inclination is in that way without a certain compassion and pity, and as towards a person who is deserting a difficult struggle which yet has in it so large a measure of Divine blessing and encouragement that it seems to me it is plainly our duty to be quite stable and to stand firm.

It is interesting in this connection to read the following tribute to Bishop Gore from a Roman Catholic writer in *Blackfriars* magazine for November. In an article entitled "Bishop Gore and the Anglican Modernists," the Rev. J. B. Reeves, O.P., says: "It is impossible not to feel for Dr. Gore some of that enthusiastic admiration which his hearers testified on the occasion of this declaration. He is consistent, loyal and sincere. Though his loyalty is to principles which are not ours, and his consistency achieved by a logic from which we dissent, we cannot, and we would not, refuse him the honour due to his intelligence, his integrity, and his unflinching courage."

Mr. Shaw's Heaven

RT. REV. CAMERON MANN, D.D.

The Bishop of Southern Florida

IT is difficult for one, whose acquaintance with Mr. Bernard Shaw comes solely from reading his books, to conclude how far he is to be taken literally and seriously in his scientific, political and religious pronouncements.

His colossal egotism, in one so clever, suggests that he is speaking with his tongue in his cheek, and is sardonically grinning at those who think he really means what he says, while slashing right and left at accepted facts and theories.

We suspect that he is only—not “the idle singer of an empty day,” for he has no song—but “the idle railer of an empty day.”

In his latest book, however, “Back to Methuselah,” he is quite insistent upon his own grave purpose. He declares he has a new Gospel, which he must preach before he dies. And he preaches it, after his own fashion, in a series of plays, wherein he sketches the progress of mankind to the ultimate desirable haven or heaven.

In these plays, and the preface to them, is much that is amusing and somewhat that is wise.

The caricatures of Lloyd George and other British politicians have more than a spice of justice; they do hit the weak spot.

The criticism of Darwinism, explaining that it touches only one phase of the evolutionary process, and that a minor one, is absolutely true.

And the exposure of the inevitable *taedium vitae*, as life is lived by the average man, is witheringly accurate.

There are some confusions and inconsistencies. For instance, there crops out in some passages a sort of Manichæan hatred and dread of *matter*, which does not accord with the intimations elsewhere that matter is a delusion which will finally be dissipated. And the Darwinian theory is condemned as hellish, because it makes the universe a result of “accident”; while elsewhere it is said that “if our calamities are accidents, there is no malice in the Cruelty of Nature and no Problem of Evil.”

But these things do not much interfere with the main thesis of "Back to Methuselah."

Mr. Shaw has discovered, to his own satisfaction, what is the cause of the present wretched condition of humanity, and what is the cure. Our present life is *too short* for us to find out what we ought to do and could do. We are mere children occupied with toys. Just when we are beginning to discern real values and noble possibilities we die, and it is all over with us. The next generation repeats our blunder, and so it goes on and on.

Of course, such reflections are not original with Mr. Shaw. They are an old story; *Si jeunesse savait, si vieillesse pouvait* is a trite refrain.

But Mr. Shaw announces that he has found a way out. The days of man need not be the three-score years and ten of the Psalmist, nor need the rare fourscore years be labor and sorrow.

Back in the dim past is the legendary Methuselah with his thousand years. It is only a legend; there never was such a man. But somehow that legend points to a truth. Man need not die—at least until he wants to. All that is necessary is that he shall *will* to live—will steadily, irrevocably, with all his might and main.

For Mr. Shaw believes in "Creative Evolution." And the power working out that Evolution is *will*. Animals and men are what they are because their ancestors determined to become such. And by the same method, choosing to become longevous and bending all thought and action to that purpose, man can become longevous.

Doubtless, the advance will be slow—though sometimes there are great leaps in evolution—but the goal is attainable. And unless man shall gain it, he will be wiped out by Nature as an unsuccessful experiment, to be replaced by something better.

Mr. Shaw thinks he sees such a Creative Evolution in the past—creatures growing because they *choose* to grow, adapting themselves rather than being adapted by outside pressures.

As to how it all began he is discreetly vague, only postulating a something—termed now Lilith and now Nature and now Holy Ghost—as the starting force. But this inability to account for the beginning only puts Mr. Shaw into the same class with all the rest of us. The Christian teacher says "In the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and "In the beginning was the Word; by Him were all things made." But he leaves God and the Word

unaccounted for, dwelling in light unapproachable.

So, Mr. Shaw should not be condemned for not providing a support for his tortoise.

But he must be condemned when that tortoise itself is not adequate to support what it is supposed to carry. He must be condemned for not seeing that his "Creative Evolution" is, just as much as Darwin's "Natural Selection," only one minor factor in the great growth of the universe.

Doubtless, living creatures have, in some ways and to some degree, developed themselves, have turned desires into habits and habits into characteristics. But when Mr. Shaw says "The great factor in Evolution is use and disuse. If you have no eyes, and want to see, and keep on trying to see, you will finally get eyes"—when he says this, he utters a wild absurdity. Eyes could not possibly come along that road.

How could a creature, which never had even the rudiments of an eye, dwelling in a world of creatures all equally blind, ever desire that power of seeing, of which it had not the faintest notion?

A similar impossibility lies in the way of almost every really big evolutionary advance. How could inert rock desire vegetable life? How could the unconscious plant desire consciousness? How could the unreasoning animal desire reason?

When we come to humanity, it is true that men, having consciousness and reason, can imagine something beyond their reach and vision, and stretch out their hands for the supposed boon. Yet even they cannot and do not imagine aught but increase of what they already possess at least in germ, or have a glimpse of elsewhere.

All of Mr. Shaw's argument for Creative Evolution by man, as based upon the analogy of preceding evolution which has led up to man, is utterly futile. That previous evolution did not proceed from the desires and resolves of the slime, the grass, and the worms.

And all of man's accomplishments hitherto do not give any warrant for asserting that he can achieve whatever he sets out to achieve. There may be unscalable barriers ahead.

That man may *desire* to live a thousand years is no assurance that he *will* live a thousand years. After æons on æons of yearning for longevity he most likely will still be forced to cry out to the Evolution Force, "Behold, thou hast made my days as it were a

span long, and mine age is even as nothing in respect of thee."

So, should we agree with Mr. Shaw that humanity's need is a term of life long enough to enable each individual to grow out of childish thought and conduct, we cannot agree with him that our resolve to gain that term must insure our success.

Nor, indeed, is it certain that, were the term gained, the result would be the sober and noble manhood which Mr. Shaw desiderates. The Methuselah legend or myth, wherein he discerns religious truth, is not very encouraging as to this. It shows almost all the longevous men as the worst kind of children, greedy, ferocious, lustful, orgulous, filling the earth with violence and tyranny,—so that the Deluge had to sweep them away.

And when we look around at the old men and women of our own civilization, we get small encouragement for the notion that increase of years means always, or even usually, increase of wisdom.

It is easy to fancy Mr. Shaw writing a play to ridicule any such opinion. How he would revel in displaying the aged miser, the aged voluptuary, the aged tyrant! How he would dilate on the vices of the longevous until he had nearly convinced himself, if not his hearers, that Herod should be acclaimed as the wisest of men.

As already intimated, it is hard to tell how far Mr. Shaw is serious in his proposed remedy for humanity's weakness and folly and viciousness. Despite his fervent protest that he is in dead earnest, we cannot help feeling that he is merely weaving a fantastic woof upon a warp which he does not himself believe to exist.

However, let us disregard all that, and turn to the pattern he displays. We can at least allow that, even though Mr. Shaw does not think his ideal possible, he may yet think it desirable. He may confess that his Utopia is nowhere in the future and still think it would be a good thing were it somewhere there.

His book is made up of the controversial Preface and five Plays.

The first Play, entitled "In the Beginning," is mythologic. Its teaching apparently is that, while the shortening of human life to the post-Methuselah limit is well, so long as humanity is of the Cain and Lua type, wantoning and slaying,—or even of the Adam and Eve type, delving and spinning,—yet there are possibilities which would justify the thousand years, and almost justify immortality. But the logical connection of this Play with the others is not clear, and very likely it has no such connection.

In the second Play, "The Gospel of the Brothers Barnabas," the time is the present day. The theme is Mr. Shaw's own,—that human life can be prolonged, and in some cases will be prolonged to at least three hundred years. That is the Gospel which the two Brothers Barnabas preach—though they do not profess to be able to make it effective in any particular case. As one of them says, "We can put it into men's heads that there is nothing to prevent its happening but their own will to die before their work is done and their own ignorance of the splendid work there is for them to do." And the other adds "Spread that knowledge and that conviction; and as surely as the sun will rise tomorrow, the thing will happen."

The third Play is entitled "The Thing Happens." We are introduced to the England of the year 2170 A.D. Amongst its inhabitants are at least two who—though unknown to the rest—were alive and busy 250 years before. They have attained a maturity of judgment and self-control which has placed them in high office and which awes all who meet them. Without knowing why, the normal people feel dwarfed in their presence. When the secret is revealed, the first impulse of the short-lived folk who have learned it, is to destroy these monsters of experience, who have put away childish things and who move about superior to their fellows—though never tyrannizing over others or aggrandizing themselves. As a result of this hostility comes a resolve of the longevous to marry with their own kind and so increase their number. And apparently there is also a determination to extend longevity beyond the 300 years then set as the limit.

So in the fourth Play, "The Tragedy of an Elderly Gentleman," the date is 3000 A.D. And the long-lived people are segregated in Ireland. There they pass their time in peace, undisturbed by the ordinary business and passions of the rest of the world. To them envoys come from the foreign lands for counsel, as of old the Greeks resorted to the Delphic Oracle.

With one such embassy arrives an elderly gentleman, who is at first horrified, but presently overwhelmed, by the utter aloofness of these grander men and women from pretty much everything which he and his short-lived fellow citizens have been esteeming of chief importance. At last he begs to be allowed to stay, since if he goes

back home it will be to die of disgust and despair. But there is only one way in which such an inferior can stay, and that is opened to him—he dies there.

In the fifth Play, "As Far As Thought Can Reach," the date is 31920 A.D. Here is Mr. Shaw's climax. Here is a world where nobody dies except by some violent accident. Of course in endless eternity some such accident must happen to everybody—so that absolute immortality is not yet gained. But, though human bodies have been altered, so that there is no more taking of food, and the manner of reproduction has greatly changed, there are still births. By resolve of the community, and in accordance with its rules, new boys and girls come into existence, and thus the race will be ever preserved.

But the babies are born with the faculties and knowledge that nowadays belong to boys and girls over a dozen years old. And as they pass into the ranks of the "Ancients," who are the mature ones of the earth, they drop courtship and marriage, and the joyance in physical beauty and social intercourse, and all worldly ambitions, and practically all material things. They care nothing for their own bodies, nothing for art, nothing for aught but extended thought. They look forward to a final stage when they may be utterly without material vesture, existing each as a pure vortex. And when somebody makes the obvious remark that "A vortex is a vortex in something. You can't have a whirlpool without water; and you can't have a vortex without gas, or molecules, or atoms or ions or electrons or something, not nothing," the Ancient replies, "No; the vortex is not the water nor the gas nor the atoms; it is a power over these things." With which bewildering answer we must abide content, and accept as the final ambition of a human being, the ultimate achievement, a vortical mind ceaselessly contemplating the infinite sum of realities.

Such seems to be the Shavian Heaven. What shall we say of it?

Why, that in its essence, so far as it can be conceived at all, it is a poor imitation of the Christian Heaven as *it* has been imagined by the Christian saints and doctors.

When Mr. H. G. Wells wrote his "God the Invisible King," he put forth a theory of the Deity and His relations to the universe which, with a few modifications, closely parallels the conception of God as it stands in the Christian Creed.

There is this difference, however. For Mr. Wells' theory we have only his authority, together with what may seem to us the value of his argument. While for the Christian Creed we have the authority of "the goodly fellowship of the prophets, the noble army of martyrs, and the holy church throughout all the world," together with whatever we may deem to be the proved historicity of the Four Gospels.

Just so, when we come to the end of "Back to Methuselah," we confront much the same idea and prospect as that beheld by St. Paul and St. Augustine, by Aquinas and Dante, by Hooker and More and Law—distorted through a Shavian mist.

For, the *Summa Theologica* says, "Final and perfect happiness can consist in nothing else than the vision of the Divine Essence." Or, as the article on "Happiness" in the Catholic Encyclopedia puts it, "*Beatitudo*, perfect happiness, complete well being, is to be obtained not in this life, but in the next. Primarily, it consists in the activity of man's highest cognitive faculty, the intellect, in the contemplation of God—the infinitely Beautiful."

There, in nobler notion and finer phrasing, is what Mr. Shaw's "Ancients" aspire to—the delighted recognition of the harmonious law of the universe.

But the article goes on at once to say, in words which leave Mr. Shaw far behind, "This immediately results in the supreme delight of the will in the conscious possession of the *Summum Bonum*, God, the infinitely Good."

Yes, with Shaw, as with Wells, we are listening to what sounds like the old faith, and yet makes us murmur

"Oh, the little more, and how much it is!
And the little less, and what worlds away!"

That is, if we are to treat Mr. Shaw's last book seriously. But can we do so? Despite all he says in the Preface, must we not refuse to think we are reading mysticism; is it not only mystification?

Psychoanalysis and Christianity

REV. CYRIL E. HUDSON

A WRITER in *The Times* remarked recently that the voice of only one living man is recognized as authoritative by large numbers of people who pride themselves on being "progressive." That man's name is Sigmund Freud. The statement contains an element of truth. Whether we like it or not, psychoanalysis—I use the word here in the widest sense—has come to stay. In psychological thought and literature of the present day, it is unquestionably in possession of the field. We do well to remind ourselves, of course, of the influence of fashion in Science as in other departments of life, and in psychology as in other branches of Science. Indications are not lacking, for example—witness Mr. Bernard Shaw's *Metabiological Pentateuch*—of a return, in biological enquiries, to the Lamarckian doctrines which Huxley and the early Darwinians believed to have been finally exploded. And so, in psychology, many of us, no doubt, will live to see at any rate a partial reaction to older conceptions: some of the conclusions so dogmatically asserted today may have to be modified—some of them, perhaps, discarded—in the light of further knowledge. Nevertheless, that this age is witnessing a remarkable advance in our knowledge of the workings of the human mind, and that the new school of psychologists has much of permanent value to teach us, no reasonable person can doubt. We cannot but regret, then, two attitudes to this school commonly adopted by intelligent—and even by "intellectual"—people. I mean, on the one hand, the attitude of sheer ridicule, and on the other that which refuses to attach any real importance to psychoanalysis on the ground of its needless preoccupation with the subject of sex. Together, they create a most unfortunate atmosphere for the infancy of a new science. Psychoanalysis provokes uproarious mirth only from those who know nothing about it beyond what they have heard in the gossip of the clubs; or whose knowledge is superficial, in the sense of being derived from writers obsessed (as, it must be admitted, some are) with the sexual aspects of the matter; or to whom the merest thought of sex is inevitably connected with indecent jokes. I shall have more to say on this subject of sex later. But at the outset it is perhaps worth while to deal shortly with the quite honest

objection to psychoanalysis on the ground of its "unhealthy" emphasis on this aspect. There are two things to be said, I think. In the first place, psychoanalytical studies are directed towards the discovery of the contents and functions of the mind. If it should turn out—I do not beg the question whether in fact it does or not: but *if* it should turn out—that the impulses connected with sex play a much greater part in the workings of the ordinary mind than has hitherto been generally recognized, or even suspected; then, we are faced with an extremely important *fact*, of such a kind that we have no sort of right to ignore it. It is no part of any man's duty to delay the progress of Truth. In the second place, there is surely some confusion of thought involved in a good deal of this talk about the "morbid" nature of psychoanalytic study.

A lady visitor in my house once took down from my shelves one of Professor Freud's big volumes, and came to me afterwards in horrified denunciation of what her eye had happened to light upon at the page she turned. But if she had been staying with a doctor she might have chanced upon an illustrated surgical treatise: and her denunciation of that as "disgusting" and "abominable" would have been as foolish as her criticism of a text-book of psychoanalysis! My point is—and I think it is worth some emphasis—that text-books of psychoanalysis are written, in a scientific spirit, for those who—whether as doctors, or clergy, or educationalists—regard it as their duty to acquaint themselves with the details and conclusions of current psychological research. They are not written for the general lay public. The charge of pornography is about as sensible, when levelled at them, as it would be if levelled against medical treatises. There will always be, of course, nasty-minded people who will pore over them from perverted motives, just as they pore over medical books and certain parts of the Bible and of Chaucer and Shakespeare. That cannot be helped. What the man in the street is concerned with is the general results of psychoanalytic research, and for this purpose there are several excellent books, written by competent authorities, at his disposal:¹ it is not

¹E.g. *The Psychology of Insanity*: by Dr. Bernard Hart. *The New Psychology*: by A. G. Tansley. *Psychology and Psychotherapy*: by Dr. William Brown. *The Psychology of Everyday Life*: by James Drever.

in the least necessary that he should read technical works written for professional students. It is with general conclusions that I shall deal, for the most part, in this article.

Perhaps the most widely-known fact about psychoanalysis is that in essence (considered in the limited therapeutic sense) it consists of a very intimate kind of confession by a patient to his doctor: and on this basis a considerable number of theological writers, both Roman and Anglican, have erected a new defence of the Catholic system of Confession. Here, they say, we have the age-long wisdom of the Church vindicated by the very latest psychology. Now it is true that, as we shall see presently, psychoanalysis does support certain Christian teaching about sin and the wise way of dealing with it. But there can be no doubt that the writers to whom I refer have in their enthusiasm greatly exaggerated the resemblance between psychoanalysis and confession. These superficial resemblances are altogether outweighed—not to say cancelled—by certain fundamental differences. I will only mention two. In the first place, a Christian makes his confession *to obtain pardon from God*, to have applied to his soul the precious Blood which flowed on Calvary for himself and the rest of mankind. The whole process is “supernatural,” or it is nothing. A patient opens his soul to an analyst because both of them believe that this will in itself remove the present trouble (obsession, compulsion, inertia, or whatever it may be) caused by some occurrence in his past life. But a penitent making a confession does not proceed on this theory at all. No doubt it is true that the confession, in itself, is good for his soul (more on that point presently), and that he seeks strength for the future as well as a cancellation of the guilt of the past—a conception of which psychoanalysis takes no account at all, by the way. But this strength he believes to be derived wholly from “outside”—from God, not from anything in himself or the priest. In the second place, it is of the greatest importance to recognize that the priest hearing a confession, and the psychoanalyst unearthing a “complex,” are dealing with two totally different things. The difference may be stated shortly by saying that a “complex” *cannot* be “confessed” in the way that a penitent confesses a sin—that is to say, voluntarily; for the simple reason that a complex *cannot be voluntarily recalled*. The essential thing about it is that it has been “repressed into the Unconscious” and is there-

fore beyond the reach of conscious and deliberate recollection. It is, clear, on the other hand, that never, in the confessional, is either priest or penitent dealing directly and consciously with a complex "repressed" in this technical sense: the nature of "repression" makes this impossible.

There are, then, significant differences, too frequently overlooked, between psychoanalysis and confession. But this is not to say that there are no points of contact between them, or that there is nothing to be said in favor of the practice of confession from the standpoint of this branch of psychology. We shall, I think, be better able to appreciate the support afforded to religion by science in this matter, if we give some attention, at this point, to the two psychological conceptions I have just mentioned, *viz*: The Unconscious, and Repression. We shall also, of course, have occasion to glance at certain other conceptions closely connected with these.

One of the principal tenets of the school of psychology under discussion is the prepondering part which it assigns to the instincts in the determination of conduct—and, conversely, its depreciation of the "will," considered as a separate, individual faculty, as a factor in the lives either of men or of societies. There can be little doubt that this conclusion is justified by the facts, though it would take too long to vindicate it here, and I must ask my readers to take it for granted. Now, the instincts—which may be classified in various ways, but on any theory are so many aspects of three universal factors, *viz*: the self, the "herd," and sex—are those in-born dispositions, inherited from a remote animal ancestry, with which we enter upon life endowed. The formation of personality and character is to an enormous extent the result of the impact of environment and experience upon the urgent drive and energy of these instincts. As a child grows older, he forms *enduring tendencies* to undergo certain kinds of emotion when faced with certain kinds of experience. To these "enduring tendencies" psychology gives the name of "complexes." It is clear that in any one personality they may be almost infinite in number and in character. It is clear, also, that many of them may be incompatible with one another. As a man grows older, for example, and his experience widens, the number of complexes based on his egotistic instincts which conflict with those based on his membership of various groups is likely to increase. There is thus created within him a

condition of *conflict*. Thus, we may consider the case of a boy brought up in an easy and comfortable home, sheltered from the hardness and roughness of the world, and with no reason in his own circumstances to doubt that honesty is the best policy and that all's for the best in this best of all possible worlds. Then let us suppose him, in early manhood, to be plunged for the first time into the vortex of life as it really is. He is overwhelmed with facts of which previously he has hardly suspected the existence, with cruelty and suffering and inequality and sin. Where, now, are his comfortable doctrines of the love of God and the natural kindliness of man? His peace of mind is gone until he can quell the conflict which his new experience has produced in him—the conflict arising from the formation of a new complex incompatible with many of his old ones. But the conflict *must* be quelled: the human mind is so constituted that it seeks, above all things, interior peace and equilibrium. And it possesses various ways of attaining these things.

One way is by the separation of the two opposing complexes in the mind. In the case we have imagined, the man would ignore the traditions and atmosphere of his home life while he was engaged in his work in the outside world, and would ignore the conditions of the outside world whenever he returned to his home. The two complexes would be kept in "logic-tight" compartments of his mind. Another way of solving the problem of conflict is by the process known as *rationalism*, by which is meant the unconscious, or only half-conscious, *manufacture of false reasons*. Mr. W. Trotter has described with biting irony the case of the man who, faced with an interior conflict between the facts of life and a complex based on his membership in an ecclesiastical "herd,"

"comes to see how right the herd view really is; that it is a very narrow mind which cannot see the intrinsic excellence of suffering; that the sheep and cattle we breed for eating, the calf we bleed to death that its meat may be white, the one baby out of four we kill in the first year of life, that cancer, consumption and insanity, and the growing river of blood which bathes the feet of advancing mankind, all have their part in the increasing purpose which is leading the race ever upwards and onwards to a Divine consummation of joy. Thus the conflict ceases, and the man is content to watch the blood and the purpose go on increasing together, and to put on flesh unperplexed by the shallow and querulous scruples of his youth."²

²W. Trotter: *Instincts of the Herd in Peace and War*, p. 53.

A third and more radical method of dealing with conflict is by the *repression* of one of the complexes concerned. By repression, in this connection, is meant much more than a mere "bottling-up"; nothing less, in fact, than complete banishment of the complex to that region of the mind, known technically as the *Unconscious*, which is never used, never in evidence, never deliberately called upon by us at any moment of our willing, conscious life. The significance, however, of the repression of a complex, lies in the highly important fact that the Unconscious is less a grave than a laboratory, less a storehouse than a mill. Repressed into the Unconscious, a complex does not cease to exist, or to be active: rather, it is continually striving to return to consciousness, and to exercise that influence and power which it enjoyed before its repression—which, indeed, were responsible for its repression. And it sometimes does return, but in a very curious way. We should naturally expect that the mind which is capable of repressing a complex in the thorough way I have described would be provided, also, with some mechanism to prevent its return and the renewal of its disturbing effect. (If you are wise, you don't bury a person alive without fastening the coffin-lid!) Such a mechanism the mind does in fact possess, to which psychologists have given the name of *Censor*: it acts as a sort of official, whose duty it is to see to it that a repressed complex *is* repressed, and does not return to disturb the surface³ regions of the mind which has banished it to the Unconscious. If it is to return, then, it must dodge the Censor somehow. And this, as I said just now, a repressed complex does sometimes manage to do. It does so by *adopting a disguise*, so that when it presents itself at the portals³ which divide the Unconscious from the upper³ regions of the mind, the Censor who stands sentinel there may be deluded into letting it pass as harmless and inoffensive.

Now, to put the matter briefly, one of the most important results of psychoanalysis has been the discovery that a great many of the symptoms of those "nerve" troubles which constitute one of the curses of the age in which we live are the symbolic (i.e., disguised), expressions of repressed complexes. Among these nerve troubles may be included hysteria, neurasthenia, "break-down," obsessions of various kinds, and some forms of insanity.

³All these spatial expressions are of course purely metaphorical.

I need not dilate upon the enormous importance of this discovery: it is obvious that when you have found the source of a malady you are more than half way to finding its cure. Nor is it necessary—since I do not wish, in this article, to devote too much space to the pathological aspects of the subject—that I should give copious illustrations of this discovery. I will only quote the classic case of the old woman in an asylum who for year after year spent the whole of her waking time in the mechanical performance of the actions of a shoemaker at his work. Investigation proved, first, that her insanity dated from the time when, as a girl, she had been jilted; secondly, that the faithless lover was a shoemaker. What had happened was that the circumstances connected with the breaking-off of the woman's engagement, forming a complex conflicting with the rest of the contents of her mind, has been repressed into the Unconscious. This repression had not, however, destroyed the complex, which had, on the contrary, displayed such subterranean activity as to make the woman insane and revealed itself in a disguise easily pierced when—but only when—the details of her history were known.

In the light of these facts, we are now in a position to appreciate the real bearing of psychoanalysis on the problem of sin. It warns us, in a word, of the incalculable *dangers of repression*. Now, it is clear that a sin deliberately faced and acknowledged before man and God in the confessional has, to say the least, far less chance of being repressed and forming a dangerously active complex in the Unconscious, than one slurred over and dismissed only half-repent. Let me give what I believe to be a very important illustration. Every priest, on the one hand, knows very well that there are certain solitary sins of the body to which young people, especially boys, are extraordinarily prone. On the other hand, few things are more striking, in the pathological records of psychoanalysis, than the frequency with which neuroses of various kinds are ultimately traceable to the beginnings of indulgence in these habits. I shall not, I hope, be accused of laxity if I suggest that (in England at any rate) we have given to these sins a somewhat disproportionate place in the scale, exalting them into a kind of special bogey in a class by themselves. The result has been that in children as a class they are subject, inevitably, to something like "mass repression." If we bear in mind the experience, just mentioned, of the

priest on the one hand and the psychoanalyst on the other, we are surely justified in pointing out the immense benefit which a far more general use than at present prevails among young people of the practice of auricular confession would bring to the mental and spiritual health of the whole community.

It is also worth while, perhaps, to draw attention to the obvious fact that a sense of guilt in itself inevitably produces a condition of mental conflict, and disturbs our psychic peace to a degree proportionate to our sense of the sinfulness of sin. The peace which comes from the certainty that we are forgiven, and the guilt of the past removed, effectually destroys the potentialities for harm inherent in a sense of guilt repressed into the Unconscious—ignored and forgotten—because of its unpleasantness. Statistics on such a point are from its very nature probably unobtainable, but it would not surprise me to learn that certain cases of “religious mania”—the delusion of having committed the “unforgivable sin,” for example—are found to be persons whose past spiritual life, whatever its other qualities, has not been characterized by a real acknowledgment of personal sin.

We must next observe that the discoveries of psychoanalysis, in regard to this question of repression among others, have an important bearing upon the normal as well as the abnormal activities of the mind. It is well-known that we owe much of our knowledge of the ordinary functions of the body to the study of physical disease: and the case is similar with regard to the psychic part of man's nature. The Unconscious is the receptacle of many ideas and complexes which have been repressed for slighter reasons than those involved in cases which subsequently became pathological. There is, in fact, in the minds of all of us, a strong tendency to rid ourselves of all and sundry ideas, problems, associations, memories, anxieties, etc., which by their presence in consciousness help to produce just that condition of conflict which by our very nature we are impelled to try and avoid. Repression is not the only means we adopt to attain this end; but it is the one most frequently used, the consequence being that the Unconscious of every individual is full of what may be called minor repressions. These, also, like the more serious ones referred to, seek to “return to consciousness.” This they can only do like the others, in disguise. In pathological cases, as we have seen, a repressed complex expresses itself as a

symptom. Modern psychological research suggests that a large number of the trivial and otherwise inexplicable happenings of daily life—slips of the tongue or pen, forgetting of past names or incidents, failures to remember appointments, and similar unimportant mistakes of various kinds—are in reality the indirect manifestation of *minor* repressed complexes. This is a very fascinating subject, with which, unfortunately, I have no space to deal adequately here. I must refer readers to the classic treatment of it in Prof. Freud's *Psychopathology of Everyday Life*. A good deal of Freud's work impresses the critic as more ingenious than convincing, but no unbiased reader of that extraordinary book can deny that he makes out a strong case for what at first sight seem the most preposterous theories—as, for example, that we never forget anything but what, unconsciously, we wish to forget; or that when on the spur of the moment we "think of a number" there is a quite definite reason, ascertainable by certain methods, for the particular number which arises to consciousness; or that every trivial mistake in speaking and writing is similarly "determined." Only on a strictly deterministic basis can such theories be accepted *in toto*, but with a little knowledge of psychology the average man can find illustrations in his own case of the truth of some of them—or, perhaps, of the element of truth in all of them. Thus, until recently I found myself over and over again, when emptying the pockets of a suit of clothes which I was changing for another, forgetting to take out my cigarette-case with the other articles. Obviously, this might be explained as the expression of my conviction—a conviction repressed because of its unpleasantness!—that I smoke too many cigarettes. Or, again: my wife tells me that when returning the calls of strangers who have called on her—a duty she rather dislikes—in nine cases out of ten, when the servant opens the door to her, she has forgotten the name of the person whom she has called to see!

But in normal persons it is in dreams that the Unconscious really comes into its own. The interpretation of dreams has been one of the favourite methods employed by wizards and dabblers in the occult for thousands of years: and it is interesting to reflect that the content of the magic and superstition of other ages has become the content of science in our own. The scientific study of dreams is still very young, but its foundations have been laid by

Prof. Freud, whose work in this department represents, perhaps, his most valuable contribution to psychology. The Freudian theory of dreams is by no means easy to grasp completely: but its main principles may be shortly summarized. First, the great majority of dreams — perhaps all the dreams of adults — are the symbolic expression of repressed *wishes*.⁴ Secondly, the real meaning of a dream is never to be found in the dream as recollected and related on waking. Behind this “manifest content,” which consists of symbols and disguises imposed on the repressed wish by the censor, is the “latent content” of the dream, and this “latent content” must be discovered if we would know the dream’s real significance. Thirdly, this “latent content” can be discovered—by the technique for which the word *psychoanalysis* ought in strictness to be reserved. In this process, the dreamer allows his mind to dwell in turn on each incident and object in the dream as he recollects it (the “manifest content”), rejecting *nothing* that “comes into his head” during the process: then, sooner or later, the underlying complexes and wishes symbolized by those objects and incidents are discovered—the “latent content” and real meaning of the dream revealed. I say, “sooner or later”: the “latent content” of the dreams of healthy, normal people can very often be discovered without much difficulty—and very fascinating work it is to “analyze” one’s own dreams (I do it frequently while shaving!); but the dreams of neurotics are a different matter.

There are two facts which emerge from the modern investiga-

⁴The word “wish” in this connection is used by Freud in a special sense. It is a more general word than “desire,” because known impossibility of attainment will inhibit desire, while the wish may still remain. By “wish” Freud means this general appetitive tendency, but he means more than this. The general appetitive tendency we call “wish” always implies for us a certain fairly high degree of mental synthesis, since it implies the existence of personal consciousness. It is “we” who wish, not the tendency itself. In the case of successful repression of an appetitive tendency we should not say that we still wish the satisfaction of the tendency. On the other hand, Freud would include under the term the tendency itself seeking its satisfaction in such a case. Hence in the Freudian theory “wish” is to be understood of individual tendencies and complexes, as well as of the self as a whole. (W. Drever, *op. cit.* p. 140.)

tion of dreams to which I would call particular attention. I shall have more to say about them both in a moment: at this point I only want the reader to observe the facts. The first is that the "latent content" of an enormous number of dreams is sexual in character—grossly sexual, by the standards of our waking conscious judgment. And the second fact is that there are a large number of what may be called "typical" dreams—dreams which occur in the sleep of most of us at some time or other; and that psychoanalysis suggests that these typical dreams always conceal, no matter who dreams them, the same "latent content."

I heard the other day of a lady doctor, an able woman, whose study of psychoanalysis had completely undermined her faith as a Christian. After a recent course of lectures on psychoanalysis in London, one of the audience, a girl of about twenty-five, told a friend of mine what a relief it was to her to feel that she need not go on uselessly reproaching herself for a certain bad habit: the lecturer had made it perfectly clear that the habit in question emanated from her Unconscious, that it was probably due to the instinctive repression of some unpleasant experience in childhood, and that she herself as a conscious being was in no way responsible for it. The reader who has followed the argument of the present article up to this point will be able, perhaps, to understand such cases as these, which are by no means rare. It is indeed obvious that a thoroughgoing application of Freudian principles, such as Freud himself maintains in the book already referred to, must result in a wholly materialistic philosophy, and the elimination of all belief in "free will" or in any supernatural Power capable of aiding and reinforcing human thought and conduct. Freud himself does not shrink from this conclusion: indeed, he insists on it. The following extract from the final chapter—the climax to which the rest of the book leads—of *The Psychopathology of Everyday Life* will make this clear:

"As is known, many persons argue against the assumption of an absolute psychic determination by referring to an intense feeling of conviction that there is a free will. This feeling of conviction exists, but is not incompatible with the belief in determinism."

It is clearly impossible, in an article of this length, to deal ex-

haustively with the problem of determinism:⁵ but one or two remarks may usefully be made. The opponents of the doctrine are in no way concerned to uphold the notion of a "will" in the sense of a separate "faculty" operating independently of the character and circumstances of the person "willing." Their opposition is directed against the contention that never, in human acts or conduct, is there any element of initiative, of creation, of real creative purpose, of freedom in any true sense whatever: that a man's conduct at any stage is determined *absolutely* by his previous history. Such a contention, it is to be observed, is advanced today, by workers in their branches of science, with far less confidence than it was twenty years ago, even where it has not been altogether abandoned. Doctrines of "vitalism" in some form or another are now the rule rather than the exception among competent biologists, for example. Nor is it the case—as some over-enthusiastic writers suggest—that the doctrine of Psychic Determinism is maintained in its extreme Freudian form by all other psychoanalysts. The New Psychology, writes Mr. A. G. Tansley, in his extremely able and well-informed summary of its main principles,

"need not commit itself to the conclusion that the play of instinctive forces exhausts the meaning of the human soul."⁶

We are left, then, with the arguments adduced by Freud himself. We cannot examine them here, but must repeat our conviction that they are in many cases more ingenious than convincing. Before we can accept the theory of determinism, two things must happen. In the first place, it must be shown to harmonize with the conclusions of other branches of science. This, notoriously, it does not do. Secondly, it must be shown to be the only possible—or at any rate the best possible—explanation of the psychological phenomena on which it is based. This condition it does not satisfy. Over and over again, as one reads Freud's pages, one feels that he is trying to fit facts into a theory too narrow to hold them. One has a curious sense, too, that Freud is himself the victim of an "anti-freewill complex!"—and indeed, speaking in all seriousness, nothing is more likely. He is at no pains to conceal his anti-religious and agnostic

⁵I may perhaps be allowed to refer to an article in *The Pilgrim* for July last for a fuller discussion of the problem as affected by psychoanalysis.

⁶Op. cit., p. 269.

bias in any of his books: what more probable than that his zeal for the extremest form of determinism is the product less of unimpassioned reason than of unconsciously-motivated rationalization? The exaggerations of Freud and some of his disciples, however, must not blind us to the very great importance of the fact which they exaggerate—the fact, namely, that the pressure of those layers of the mind outside our immediate and conscious control is much stronger than we are disposed to admit. For not only, be it remembered, is the Unconscious the seat of the instincts, to the operations of which all our actions can in the ultimate analysis be traced, and of repressed complexes; it is the seat also of a variety of physical constellations created by the impact of experience on the instincts, and determining, to a great extent, the character of our reaction to further experience as it arrives. The importance of this can hardly be exaggerated. For we can, to a large extent, *choose our experience*. The friends we make, the books we read, the recreations and amusements we follow, the profession we adopt—these, and much more, are under our conscious control, and they form a large part of our “experience.” It is clear, further, that the religious atmosphere in which we choose to live is “experience” too: and if I were writing a strictly theological disquisition I should of course dwell on the fact that the atmosphere of the Church, the companionship of Christ and His saints, is the form of experience certain above all others to make our Unconscious healthy and sweet.

We have learnt recently of another way in which we can consciously affect the character of the Unconscious. It so happens that this year which has seen, in England, the extraordinary development of popular interest in psychoanalysis, has seen also the publication of Charles Baudouin’s remarkable account of the work of the French psychologist Coué.⁷ Those who have read this book will agree that Coué’s methods have produced, and are producing, therapeutic results little short of incredible. What is the secret of those methods? The answer to that question lies in the one word *autosuggestion*. What Coué does is to tell his patients that they can cure themselves. It is not he who cures them, but *their own Unconscious*. And this it does by receiving from the patient’s conscious mind a “suggestion” to the effect that he is *getting better*

⁷*Suggestion and Autosuggestion*: by Charles Baudouin: English trans. by Eden & Cedar Paul.

and better in all respects day by day (not, be it noted, that he *wants*, or is determined, to get better, but that he *is* getting better. The whole process is the work, not of the "will," but of the imagination). Here, then, we are told by one whose whole time is taken up by proving in countless cases the value of his advice, of a method by which we can cure some at least of our mental and physical disabilities through the medium of the Unconscious. (Of course, there is much more to be said about autosuggestion than this—about the conditions under which alone it can be successfully practised, and so on; and the reader must be referred to Baudouin's book: but this is the essential point.) And once more, if this were a sermon, I should insist that the highest form of autosuggestion must be Christian. I should ask, What of suggestions made to our Unconscious by the indwelling Christ Himself while we open our hearts to him in prayer?—and what of the power of such autosuggestions as "Day by day the love, and the gentleness, and the purity of Christ constrain me more and more?"

We may conclude, then, that the bearings of what has come to be called The New Psychology upon religion are various and important. It is clearly the duty, not only of the clergy, but of parents and teachers and all who are in any way responsible for the moral and spiritual education of others to familiarize themselves with its general conclusions. I pass now to a brief consideration of a particular application of the findings of psychoanalysis of which increasing use is being made at the present day.

We have already observed that the modern study of dreams tends to show

- (1) That the majority of dreams are symbolical.*
- (2) That a great many dreams are typical; that is to say, that

*I heard Miss Evelyn Underhill read a paper recently in which she suggested that Prayer consists in "the conversion of Grace into an effective autosuggestion," or words to that effect.

†I am told by a competent psychoanalyst that in his latest book Freud admits that he has hitherto over-estimated the symbolic character of dreams, and that many dreams are merely recollective. I have not read the book referred to, and so have not commented on this admission in the text of my article: but it is a highly interesting and significant one.

certain dream-objects and dream-incidents are always the symbolised expression of the same wish, no matter whose the dream is:

and at this point we must refer to another theory, fundamental to Freud and his disciples, *viz.*: that a great many of the commoner dream-symbols are to be referred to the experiences of our earliest years. Thus, Freud suggests that the common dream that one is naked or very scantily clad is an echo of the artless exhibitionism of childhood; and that dreams of flying, falling, hovering, etc., have reference to "the movement games which have such extraordinary attractions for the child. What uncle has never made a child fly by running across the room with it with arms outstretched, or has never played falling with it by rocking it on his knee and then suddenly stretching out his leg, or by lifting it up high and then pretending to withdraw support?"⁹ These two examples refer, of course, to the symbols used in dreams: but there is a considerable amount of evidence that the latent content itself of a dream may be a wish which has been buried in the Unconscious since early childhood. One of the most startling of Freud's theories is that to dream of the death of a parent is the echo of a fixation of infantile love upon the other parent, but the evidence is practically conclusive that this is the correct interpretation of such a dream in many neurotic cases. Childhood is the time of phantasy-making, and children display their fondness for the pastime not only in dreams, but in the "let's pretend" of waking life, and in their devotion to anyone who can "tell them a story." So do they escape from any unwelcome experience in everyday life. It is on these bases that a certain school of writers on psychoanalysis build the theory that, in the words of one of them, "the myth is the fragment of the infantile soul-life of the people."¹⁰ It is suggested, that is to say, that the origin of a great many religious beliefs may be accounted for as the expression of racial wishes, just as dreams are the expression of individual wishes. It is well known that almost identical myths are found in widely-separated parts of the world: this, we are told, is because there are typical racial wishes just as there are typical individual wishes. Further, myths, like dreams, are symbolical, so that their real meaning is to be sought for behind their "manifest content": and, to make the parallel complete, the inner meaning of

⁹*Interpretations of Dreams*, p. 237.

¹⁰*Dreams and Myths*: Dr. Karl Abraham.

myths—their “latent content”—as of dreams, is generally sexual in character.¹¹ Lastly, the universality of the religious phenomena is to be attributed in great measure to the operation of “herd instinct”—that mighty impulse which compels man, as it compels all social animals, to accept the opinions, beliefs and customs of the society of which he is a member.

“The energy and interest,” writes Dr. Carl Jung, “which today we put into science and technique, the man of antiquity gave in great part to his mythology. . . . We (can) draw a parallel between the phantastical, mythological thinking of antiquity, and the similar thinking of children; between the lower human races and dreams. . . . The age which created the myths thought childishly, that is to say phantastically, as in our age is still done, to a very great extent (associatively or analogically) in dreams. . . . Has humanity at all ever broken loose from the myths? Every man has eyes and all his senses to perceive that the world is dead, cold and unending, and he has never yet seen a God, nor brought to light the existence of such from empirical necessity. On the contrary, there was need of a phantastic, indestructible optimism, and one far removed from all sense of reality in order, for example, to discover in the shameful death of Christ really the highest salvation and the redemption of the world.”¹²

The views here alluded to have not as yet been developed in detail by more than two or three writers, and, until they are, it is, perhaps, premature to discuss them in detail. But there can be little doubt, I think, that a formidable attack on the religious view of life is maturing in this quarter, and it may be well, therefore, to suggest some quite general considerations on the other side. It is to be noticed, in the first place, that the writers who claim to explain the origin of religious beliefs on the analogy of the symbolism of typical dreams are precisely those who subscribe most enthusiastically to the Freudian view of the invariably sexual character of dream-symbolism. Their case, that is to say, stands or falls with two things—(1) the symbolic nature of dreams, and (2) the sexual

¹¹It is for this reason that it is hardly possible, in an article written for the general reader, to quote the actual arguments and illustrations used by the school of writers referred to.

¹²*Psychology of the Unconscious*, pp. 26-30.

meaning of dream-symbols. Now, it is surely highly significant that these are the very theories most frequently criticised by writers on psychoanalysis who have been independent enough to break away, so to speak, from the Mother Church of the movement. Outside the inner Freudian circle, there is a growing disposition to think that many dreams are not symbolic at all, but merely recollective,¹³ and that in those cases in which a dream is certainly symbolic, the symbol may often disguise some repression not necessarily sexual in character.

It is when psychoanalysis is pressed into the service of such a theory as this that the charge most commonly made against it, of exclusive emphasis on the subject of sex, does contain a large element of truth. The psychologist who equates religion and sexuality can only maintain his thesis by ignoring a great number of relevant facts, by entirely discounting the evidence of religious experience, and by simply ruling out the conclusions of ninety per cent of the experts in his own department. It is well to put this last point as plainly as possible. There is no general disposition, even among the most rationalistic of psychologists, to believe that the religious complex has its roots solely in the instinct of sex. That instinct, no doubt, plays an important contributory part: but it is supplementary, not preponderating. Thus Ribot, Leuba, and McDougall emphasize the importance of the instinct of fear in this connection: the last of these maintains that the ultimate bases of religion are wonder, "negative self-feeling," fear, tender emotion, and curiosity.

May we not add that the writers in question are in grave danger

¹³See note 8. Perhaps Freud may next admit that, of the symbols which are found in dreams, fewer than he has hitherto insisted are symbolic of *sexual* repressions! (Of course, the reader will not make the mistake of supposing that I dispute the sexual character of many dreams and many neuroses. If psychoanalysis teaches us anything, it teaches the enormous and generally unsuspected part played in human conduct, normal and abnormal, by the sex instinct: and one of the chief duties of every teacher and parent, as well as of every spiritual director, is to "sublimate" into other channels the surplus energy of this instinct. But this is a very large subject, and I have thought it better not to attempt to deal with it in my article.)

of repressing their sense of humor—with what possibly horrid peril to their own Unconscious we would not, of course, presume to say? Certainly, the phallic theory of religious origins and religious experience, to a man with any personal religion at all, must always seem quite extraordinarily funny! After all, the *reductio ad absurdum* has a certain validity as argument. Readers of *The Varieties of Religious Experience* will, I am sure, be grateful to me for recalling to their minds, in this connexion, part of William James's famous footnote to the chapter on "Religion and Neurology":

"Why not equally call religion an aberration of the digestive function, and prove one's point by the worship of Bacchus and Ceres? . . . In fact, one might almost as well interpret religion as a perversion of the respiratory function. The Bible is full of the language of respiratory oppression: 'Hide not thine ear at my breathings; my groaning is not hid from thee; my heart panteth; my strength faileth me; my bones are hot with my roaring all the night long; as the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so my soul panteth after thee, O my God.' *God's Breath in Man* is the title of the chief work of our best known American mystic (Thomas Lake Harris); and in certain non-Christian countries the foundation of all religious discipline consists in regulation of the inspiration and expiration. . . . Moreover, what is to be done with the fact that the religious age *par excellence* would seem to be old age, when the uproar of the sexual life is past?"¹⁴

There is a last, and most important, weakness in the theory under discussion, and it is displayed by many writers besides psychoanalysts who attempt to evaluate religion from a critical and external point of view. It consists in ignoring the fundamentally *historic* basis of the greater religions of the world. Where is the sense, when you are talking about the origins of Christianity, in simply leaving out of account the fact that we know its origins perfectly well? We know that its basis is the *fact* that at a particular time in the world's history, and in a particular part of the earth's surface, a certain Person lived and taught and died. No man, seeking to formulate a philosophy of life, can afford to ignore relevant facts: no teacher has the right to offer a philosophy for the world's acceptance which flagrantly ignores relevant facts. The *Fact of Christ* is relevant: and the believing Christian may well demand that the non-Christian critic shall give some indication

¹⁴*Varieties*, pp. 11-12.

that he has really faced the significance, not only of the spiritual experience of two thousand years, nor only of the fruits, in ethics and art and intellectual pursuits, of that experience, but of the historical foundation without which none of these things would exist for his examination and dissection.

(LONDON, October, 1921)

Anglican Modernism

REV. FREDERICK SHERMAN ARNOLD, M.A., S.T.B.

THE report of the Girton conference of Modernist Churchmen (they call themselves "Modern Churchmen," which would include all developments since the fall of Constantinople) appears in *The Modern Churchman* for September, 1921.¹ From the scholarly essays appearing here, we may gather the views of an important group of thinkers in the Church of England.

These views have not yet appeared in the American Church, unless Professor Kirsopp Lake be in the American Church. In fact we doubt if, in this refined form, they ever do appear in the American Church. The underlying thought, that of T. H. Green and the Neo-Kantians, for instance, does not underlie many American minds. The conservative wing of American liberal Churchmen seems to rest upon the recent and refreshing tomes of Doctor Dorner, while the radical wing is rather reminiscent of S. L. Clemens, a native critic of Mediaevalism.

Yet, though Liberal Churchmanship in this country is never likely to digest the thought in these discussions, it is quite possible that some group may shortly take over the conclusions of these English scholars. Theological breadth in America often exhibits a dogmatic opposition to dogma and a simple, uncritical faith in criticism. Hence, it were well to examine the "Modern Churchmen's Conference of 1921."

Here we are at last emerging on a stage of controversy, which, we believe, must be fought out without the aid of ceremonial. Somehow, probably because of the state of English Church-law, most nineteenth century controversies seemed to hinge on a point

¹*The Modern Churchman*, September, 1921. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 49 Broad Street. Conference number, 3/6 net.

of ritual. It was always candlesticks or chasubles or gestures that courts and newspapers discussed. One would have thought that Anglicans could only understand the externals of their own religion. This was very misleading to the general public, who still think our schools, High, Low, or Broad, are all form. Of course, there really was never any such thing as Ritualism or a Ritualist controversy. What the Low Churchman opposed and what the High Churchman fought for was the various principles that ceremonial acts symbolized. Neither High nor Low Churchmen were quite so silly as to spend so much energy on mere ritual as such. Nevertheless, it is a kind of relief, if harassed orthodoxy may say it, to get into a clean intellectual argument which does not have to hide itself behind the skirts of a vestment.

That, however, is the only relief orthodoxy is likely to find in these pages. Other controversies have stormed around the barbican. These authors pass the moat and the wall to assault the keep. The subject of these essays is the doctrine of the Incarnation.

From the Eleatics down to recent times certain logical difficulties are inherent in the concepts of the absolute and the relative, the infinite and the finite, the real and the phenomenal, God and man. The Eleatics resolved the controversy by denying the parts, the Atomists by denying the whole. Spinoza referred everything to the absolute, Leibnitz tried to make his monads ultimate. The Neo-Kantians regard every mind as a case of the divine mind. William James and, probably, Bergson believe in a plural universe. This antinomy seems inherent in the inquiry.

A similar problem arose within the theology of the Incarnation. Pagan religion recorded that Apollo had come down to herd the horses of Admetus and that Ganymede had gone up to pour the wine of the gods. Plotinus taught that creation was an emanation from the full chalice of overflowing Deity. Epictetus regarded the gods as spirits of a higher essence than men. Without referring to these heathen tendencies, however, it is enough to say that the God-man might be thought of as God veiled in flesh or as man associated to Deity. Noetus and the Patripassians thought the one; Paul of Samosata and the dynamistic monarchians thought the other. Between these two opposite schools the Catholic theology arose. The development passes through St. Paul, the Epistle to the Hebrews, St. John's Gospel, St. Irenæus, St. Athanasius, the tome of St. Leo

and issues in the Niceno-Constantinopolitan creed and the definitions of Chalcedon.

The doctrine of the Logos makes a distinction in the divine essence: the doctrine of the Trinity. The Mind of God is personally distinct from the divine will, the Source of Deity. He is incarnate in a manhood where the flesh, the mind, the will is human, yet so that there is a real unity in the Incarnate Personality, Who is God. So Leontius of Byzantium and John of Damascus teach the East and St. Leo teaches the West, interpreting the Chalcedonese theology.

Yet this Catholic issuance of the dogma was not achieved without long controversy in which two schools continually sought to upset the nicety of the theological balance. The school of Antioch was ever jealous for the manhood, the school of Alexandria for the Deity. One school tended down an avenue at the end of which waited the smiling heretic Apollinarius. The other hurried by a lane that led out to the horrid spectre of Arius. These teachers replaced the less metaphysical and cruder heresies of the Patripassians and Monarchians of the third century.

"Both parties to that long controversy were guilty of the same error," says Canon M. G. Glazebrook, D.D.² "Whereas Jewish and Greek traditions alike represented God and man as belonging to two different orders of being, Jesus affirmed that they were bound together by a real kinship. . . . Surely it was a sense of that unity—and not a mere inheritance of eschatological terms from the book of Enoch—that enabled Him to speak of Himself both as the Son of Man and the Son of God. Did He not mean us to learn that He was in the highest sense a Son of God, not in spite of His humanity, but because His humanity was uniquely perfect?" and he approvingly quotes Professor Henry Jones:

"There is not one element of Christian morality or of Christian religion which is not deepened through the recognition of the veritable unity of the divine and human nature, which is the essence of the idealism of Jesus."

Perhaps we might venture to interpret the teaching of the speakers at the Girton conference somewhat as follows.

An essential element in the message of Jesus is the oneness of

²p. 210.

God and man. The divine and human natures flow into each other. They are not merely morally one, which oneness might go with a difference in kind, they are one in kind. God and man are the same kind.

Thus Jesus "described the repentance of the sinner, not as a change of nature but as a return to normal relations, an acknowledgement of the essential unity between the Father in heaven and His sons on earth. Surely it was a sense of that unity . . . that enabled Him to speak of Himself both as the Son of Man and the Son of God."³

If man and God are one kind, we can only say that man is a finite case of the infinite God.

"That man is not merely the creature and plaything of God, that there is a certain community of nature between God and man, that all human minds are reproductions 'in limited modes' (to use the expression of my old master, T. H. Green) of the Divine Mind, that in all human thinking there is a reproduction of the Divine thought, and above all that in the highest ideals that the human conscience recognizes there is a revelation of the ideal eternally present in the Divine mind—these are the presuppositions under which alone any real meaning can be given to the doctrine."⁴

Professor Pringle-Pattison is quoted in the same sense; but "he goes on to complain, as philosophers usually do, that this Incarnation of the Son has been limited to a single individual."

Indeed here is the first difficulty the Neo-Kantians meet when they enter theology. If the true doctrine of the Incarnation, as Jesus Himself revealed it, means that man and God are one, true enough God is incarnate in Jesus, but why not in every man? Dean Rashdall meets this difficulty on what perhaps may be called moral grounds. He says:⁵

"I quite agree with him that it is impossible to maintain that God is fully incarnate in Christ and not incarnate at all in anyone else. On the other hand, the philosophical critics of theology do

³Dr. Glazebrook, p. 210.

⁴Dean Rashdall, p. 282.

⁵p. 282.

not, as it appears to me, recognize how spiritually valueless—nay, how ethically pernicious—such a doctrine becomes when God is thought of as incarnating Himself equally in all human beings, the worst as well as the best. If we say ‘human nature is divine,’ and stop there, we enter upon a line of thought which ends in the Hindoo theology.” Quite so!

“There is much in human nature which is not divine at all.”

In Jesus God is incarnate fully because He is humanity at the highest mode of being human.

“That we are justified in thinking of God as like Christ, that the character and teaching of Christ contains the fullest disclosure both of the character of God Himself and of His will for man—that is (so far as so momentous a truth can be summed up in a few words) the true meaning for us of the doctrine of Christ’s divinity.”⁶

The passages in which these scholars speak of the power of the personality and of the elevation of the moral character of Jesus are impressive and may well be studied and imitated by all of us. Even the miracles are for the most part accepted. “All these recent lines of research and experiment, which we sum up under the head of psychotherapy, confirm in substance the stories of healing, of insight and intuition.”⁷

Yet for obvious reasons the Virgin Birth is rejected. Moreover, the historic Jesus is the Jesus of the Synoptists. St. Paul and St. John’s Gospel are plainly, for these writers as for the Catholic Church, the first and greatest works of the Catholic theology.

The volume ends with a discussion on the creeds. Naturally, the creeds do not express the Modernist point of view. Yet, “It is of little use to suggest a revised form of any existing creed, as though we could whittle down belief to some irreducible minimum: that is an entirely wrong attitude in which to approach the problem. . . . The terms of fourth century metaphysics are almost meaningless to us today. We need a confession of faith in which the

⁶p. 283.

⁷C. W. Emmett, p. 216.

⁸T. H. Bindley, p. 311.

essentials are implicit, rather than a Creed which attempts to make them explicit. Would not a confession of personal devotion to our Lord Jesus Christ as the Supreme Revealer of the Love of God, and as the Saviour of the world, suffice?"

If we have not unfaithfully compressed into few words the system of these authors, we cannot but feel therein a certain beauty and even a certain truth. Jesus did indeed reveal a human kinship to the Father. Surely, it is because He, and He alone, presents our humanity at its very highest that we hail Him: "My Lord and My God!" Metaphysically, too, are not the authors at least within orthodox limits in arguing that the human mind is a case of the divine mind reproduced in a limited mode? Half the thinkers of Christendom including, probably, St. Augustine, Scotus Erigena, John Tauler and the Mediaeval mystics, Bishop Berkeley and T. H. Green, have taught just this.

Unfortunately the authors do not stop at the divine mind. They assert a unity of divine and human nature. Nature may include more than mind. Perhaps, if the human mind is a case of the divine mind, it is humanly natural that human mind is a case reproduced in limited modes. In other words, may not human nature be finite and divine nature infinite? If so, may not the problem of the incarnation, at least in one aspect, be the reconciliation of the infinite and the finite? Is not that the secular metaphysical problem, from Parmenides to Herbert Spencer? Really, it does seem to us that these Modernists are a little *ingénu* in thinking they can unravel the whole skein of metaphysic by talking about something else.

Of course, they will retort that the Catholic theology does not satisfy the metaphysical questions either. It probably does not. It was not intended to do so. But it recognizes the problem. When the union of two natures is said to be "without confusion, without conversion, without division, without separation," not much may be explained, but at least the problem is recognized.

Most theologians have always held as one great difference between the human and divine that God has *a-seritas* and man has not. In other words, that God is Creator and man creature. This has been always supposed to constitute a difference. One would think it must. The concept is rather theological than metaphysical, perhaps, but that does not prove that it is not true. As to the proofs from synoptic texts, that Jesus taught the unity of divine and

human nature, we cannot see any texts that prove any such thing. The conception is metaphysical and the words of Jesus can hardly be made to yield a metaphysical thesis.

The danger of carrying over the Neo-Kantian unity of mind into a unity of nature as well, is suspected by Dean Rashdall. "If we say 'human nature is divine,' and stop there, we enter upon a line of thought which ends in the Hindoo theology." We do indeed. If man is a case of God in limited modes, let him realize himself fully and he is God. As limitation is negation, the human, the finite, the particular is unreal. It is illusion. Let the soul deny illusion and rest in Brahman. If Jesus did that He did what Gautama did, what anyone else can do.

No, says Dean Rashdall, "There is much in human nature which is not divine at all. It is just because it so emphatically negatives a non-moral doctrine of divine immanence that the Christian doctrine of a supreme Incarnation in *one* historical Person becomes so valuable." In other words, it is the moral perfection of Jesus that resolves the limits of the human nature.

The first thing this suggests is that the theory leaves Jesus no longer unique. For others follow Him. It is the Christian theory that we shall all "come in the unity of the faith, and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ."⁹ Either here or in eternity the saints, that is, eventually, all the redeemed, will be like Christ. From various passages, we believe our authors also hold this view.

Now on the Catholic view, this divine evolution will not interfere with the uniqueness of the Son of God. He is the Creator of the redeemed life. On the modernist view He is the exemplar. When another has reached the Christ-stage, that other is as much the Christ as Jesus. Just as Gautama is not any more Buddha than any other person who becomes Buddha. Quite evidently, the Modernist theories do "end in the Hindoo theology," even after we have made the ethical qualification to the confusion of humanity and deity, which Dean Rashdall suggests.

The origin of species in biology was explained by Charles Darwin as due to the natural selection of variations, since which time biological controversy has raged over the origin of variations.

⁹Eph. IV: 13.

In like manner, when Dean Rashdall discriminates the divine manhood of Jesus from manhood in general by the good will of Jesus, the question at once arises; how was this will to holiness possible in Jesus? That it was not possible in anyone else a brief perusal of classic and Hebrew literature might convince us. That it could not happen naturally the ideas of atavism, heredity and natural law suggest.¹⁰ Whence this overwhelming moral genius? Rationalists and many radical Unitarians meet this question simply by saying He was not so overwhelmingly a genius as the Church teaches; that He simply marked an advance on Isaiah as Isaiah seems to mark an advance beyond Elisha. We know, however, from these papers that these authors do not hold that view. They seem to be willing to say of the humanity of Jesus all that can be said. Whence, then, the moral miracle of the will of Jesus Christ? Our authors do not explain. Perhaps they have become so accustomed to the feelings of Catholic piety within our Church that they do not realize what an atmosphere of dogma they are carrying about them out into the camp of Modernism. It remains true, however, that if you deny the wonder of the Godhood in Jesus the wonder of the Manhood of Jesus rises to confuse and confound you. Radicals, who have been reared in radicalism, see that easily and doubt His human perfection. But no Protestant is ever entirely emancipated from Catholicism. So our Modernist authors leave us with the incomprehensible human holiness of Jesus unexplained. Leave us, too, with the uniqueness of Jesus vanishing in the growing holiness of the saints.

Christianity might conceivably be all wrong, Modernist and Catholic alike. If, however, as these authors believe and as we believe, Christianity is true, it seems to us more likely that that form of Christianity will prove true which is logical and consistent with itself. The Catholic theology has always known the truth that current thought expresses by natural law, atavism, heredity, habit, the cake of custom. "For all have sinned and come short of the glory of God," says St. Paul. "In Adam all die." It was im-

¹⁰Heredity and atavism are phrases that seem more or less to point to the doctrine of the depravity of nature: the physical side of a theological fact.

possible for the human will to break the bonds of natural law in the corrupted human nature and to serve God.

Then "when the fulness of the time was come, God sent forth his Son, made of a woman" (Gal. iv:4). St. Paul did not shrink from the doctrine of the virgin-birth (*pace* the minimizing critics of this text). St. Paul did not regard the wonder of Christ's manhood as explicable from within humanity, which St. Paul knew to be fallen.

God the Word, the Thought of God, entered into personal union with humanity at a point where the natural law of heredity was restricted by the conditions of Christ's birth. He reared His human will in conformity with His divine will. He broke the bounds of heredity and displayed the perfect manhood. He mystically communicates His divine Manhood to our manhood at the sacramental moments He appoints. He is the divine-human Lord of the higher life, which He communicates, which restores us to the Father. Because He is not merely the Lord of Life, but the Creator thereof, He is forever unique though all the saints fully share His glory, for as we are His creatures physically, so is He also morally our Creator.

We had intended to discuss the Modernist view of the creeds, but space fails us; to show that they are exclusive because they were intended to be exclusive—to exclude error. They are direction-posts which would often save a Modernist weary wanderings to no-whither. George H. Lewes remarked that "in England and France we have been saved from perpetuating the frivolous discussions of the schoolmen, mainly because we have retained their nomenclature and terminology, and are warned by these from off scholastic ground; but the Germans, having invented a new philosophical language, do not perceive that the new terms disguise old errors; they fail to recognize in *Irrlicht* the familiar face of *Ignis fatuus*." In like manner we are convinced that the Modernists' desire to be modern leads them astray and that if they had given due weight to the failures first of Monarchianism, later of Nestorianism, finally of Unitarianism, they would have been warned off from their present inconsistencies.

The Book of the Revelation

REV. CHARLES CARROLL EDMUNDS, D.D.

THE writer well remembers listening, when a boy, with fascinated awe, to the burning periods of an eloquent bishop, long since dead, who gathered crowded congregations to his expositions of the book of Revelation. With quotation after quotation, with compelling calculations of days and months and years, with stern exposures of the subtle wiles of wicked Jesuits, with vivid picturings of the growing iniquity of this sinful world, he demonstrated with apparent conclusiveness that the End was close at hand and that the tremendous panorama of Judgment was about to unroll.

Some years later, in the theological seminary, the commentaries of Bishop Wordsworth were the approved aids to the study of the New Testament, and one learned from them that the Babylon of the Apocalypse was papal Rome, that the first beast and the scarlet woman were the papacy itself, that the second beast was the Roman hierarchy, and that the plagues ushered in by the sounded trumpets or poured out from the seven vials represented the long-delayed catastrophies which should overtake all these.

Yet again, a ministry in village parishes brought frequent contact with preachers in whose eyes lurked a gleam of fanaticism, who cited texts from every part of the Bible with marvelous facility, and who could prove from Daniel and Revelation the immediate Advent of Christ and the setting up of a millennial kingdom on earth. These led timid folk to view with special apprehension certain rather unusual meteoric showers and the close approach of a great comet which for weeks hung conspicuous in the heavens.

Only the other day, during the great war, excited exegetes thought they discovered in Holy Writ the features of Kaiser Wilhelm, the atrocities of the German armies, the impious ravings of the professorial signers of manifestoes, and the bulky form of the idolized Hindenburg—all shown long ago to the exile in Patmos. Even today, the mail may bring a rudely illustrated sheet, with startling headlines and threatening predictions emphasized with frequent capitals and italics, proclaiming the approaching overthrow from heaven of priesthood and prelacy, of Church and creed, and the ushering in of another world patterned after the peculiar fashion of some new sect or prophet.

Such follies and fanaticisms, such wrestings of Scripture, such crudities of interpretation, have from the very beginning made many suspicious of the book of the Revelation. The prejudiced controversialist Gaius at the close of the second century; the cautious, moderate, temporizing, courtier-bishop and historian, Eusebius, at the beginning of the fourth century; the violent German reformer, Luther, in the sixteenth century—all hesitated over its right to stand within the canon of Holy Scripture. Today, we fancy, there are many good Christians who are more puzzled than edified by much of its contents.

But there is another side. The great hymns of the Church—the *Dies Iræ*, "Jerusalem the Golden," "O Mother dear Jerusalem," "Blessed City, heavenly Salem," "O what the Joy and the Glory must be"—these, and many others which have come down the ages and which still utter the longings and worship of human hearts, draw both thought and imagery from this mysterious book. "The Divine Comedy," "Paradise Lost," "the Pilgrim's Progress," the latest Gospel hymn find here both inspiration and vocabulary. Indeed we can picture the other world, the unseen existences and powers about and above us, the continuing life of the departed, the blessedness which awaits us hereafter, the life which God gives to His saints, His searching judgment, only in the symbols of the swift angelic armies, the white-robed throngs with their ceaseless songs of praise, the river of the water of life clear as crystal, the city with walls of gold and gates of pearl, which needs no candle nor light of the sun, for the Lord God giveth them light. As we bow in adoration at some solemn Eucharist the vision our hearts behold is that of the Lamb in the midst of the throne, encircled by the glowing rainbow and the glassy sea, and worshipped by the four mysterious creatures, the gold-crowned elders and the multitude which no man can number. Our *Sanctus* echoes the heavenly "Holy, Holy, Holy." Our anthems but catch up the majestic "Alleluia, for the Lord God omnipotent reigneth." Our comfort in the hour of bereavement is the assuring promise, "God shall wipe away all tears from their eyes; and there shall be no more death, neither sorrow, nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain." Penitent sinners take courage as they read of those who "have washed their robes and made them white in the blood of the Lamb." We would lose much which is infinitely precious to us all if we were obliged to blot out the Revelation from our Bibles.

But the real key to the understanding of this wonderful book is to be found in the recognition of its true character. First, let it be remembered that it is, as its name declares, a revelation, an unveiling; or, to use the Greek term, an apocalypse. This means that it belongs on the literary side to a class of writings which has its own peculiar characteristics, as marked and distinct as those of poetry, or drama, or romance. There are many books, both within and without the canon of Holy Scripture, which must be classified under this head. Such are Daniel and Second Esdras. Such, in large part, are Ezekiel and Zechariah. Without the Bible entirely are many others: Enoch, Baruch, the Assumption of Moses, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Sybilline Oracles, the so-called apocalypses of Moses, Paul, Peter, Mary, etc. It is hardly necessary to say that these latter are as far inferior to the inspired writings as the apocryphal Gospels are to the genuine Gospels. Nevertheless, as the works of Parkman and of Peter Parley are alike histories, and as the Birds of Aristophanes and the latest production of George Cohan are alike comedies, so all the above must be reckoned as apocalypses.

Now, just as poetry, the drama, fiction, and history each has its conventions, style and vocabulary, and as each must be judged and interpreted by its own standards and methods, so it is with apocalyptic. We do not use one and the same measure for the "Divine Comedy" of Dante and the "Analogy" of Bishop Butler, for Shakespeare's "Hamlet" and Gibbons' "Decline and Fall," for Aesop's "Fables" and Plato's "Republic." Even in Holy Scripture we make a distinction between Exodus and Canticles, between the Twenty-third Psalm and the prophecy of Nahum; and we understand each of these books the better because, consciously or unconsciously, we apply different *criteria*. When we have fully recognized that First Corinthians, albeit a book of the New Testament, is a letter and a portion of a considerable correspondence between St. Paul and his converts, we have removed most of the difficulties it presents to the casual reader. In exactly the same way, when we keep in mind that Revelation is an apocalypse—vastly superior to any other work bearing that name—and perceive that many of its seemingly peculiar features are common to all apocalypses, we have the explanation of its most puzzling characteristics.

Apocalypses are, as has been well said, "tracts for hard times," and are meant to confirm faith, and to strengthen confidence in the power and justice of Almighty God. They set forth His majesty, His omnipotence, His wisdom, His watchful care for His saints, His secret guidance of the universe, and the certainty and swift approach of His awful judgment upon the wicked. They bid His persecuted and anxious servants look up to the throne of the Most High in absolute trust to His ultimate vindication of His righteousness. They "unveil mysteries," that is they endeavor to set forth by vision and symbol the working of supernatural forces behind and above the fluctuations of human society. They picture the Divine judgments as did the prophets of old, under the figure of great catastrophes in the natural world. They speak of falling skies, of stars raining down from heaven, of floods of water poured forth on the earth, of earthquakes, lightnings, famines, pestilences, and bloody wars. Or again, they draw their imagery from the ancient temple, with its altar of sacrifice, its mysterious Presence, its gleaming lights, its smoking incense, and its chanting choirs. They depict tremendous beasts with seven heads and ten horns and mouths uttering blasphemies. Ezekiel describes the four living creatures in language as impressive as it is bewildering. Zechariah sees the golden candlestick, with its pipes and lamps and the two olive-trees which feed it; and again, the four chariots, with red and white and black and grizzled horses, which he interprets as the four winds of heaven, which go forth from before the Lord of the whole earth. Isaiah beholds the "Lord, high and lifted up" and hears the seraphim cry "Holy, Holy, Holy." Esdras tells his dream of the eagle which came up from the sea, and which had twelve feathered wings and three heads. Baruch declares that trouble shall seize the wicked when they see the Son of woman sitting on the throne of his glory, and that the sword of the Lord of spirits shall be drunk with their blood. Enoch predicts, "On that day shall Mine Elect One sit on the throne of glory and make choice among their deeds." Daniel says of the Ancient of Days, that His garment was white as snow, His hair like pure wool, His throne like fiery flame, His wheels as burning fire.

This is symbolism, not portraiture. Many scenes would be fantastic, absurd, grotesque or impossible, if we were to reduce them to mere literalism. Read carefully that glowing picture of

the Son of Man in the opening chapter of Revelation, observe how unintelligible it would be if regarded as prosaic description, and mark well how the phrases in which it is drawn are taken from scattered passages in older apocalypses. Go over this book in a reference Bible and you will perceive that it is a mosaic, made of jewels from splendid portions of the Old Testament and employed here with a freedom which often disregards their former significance. We are irresistibly reminded of the glorious Italian churches, enriched with the spoil of many an ancient temple or forum.

There is then a vocabulary common to all apocalyptic—a vocabulary of symbols and images which, like the words in ordinary writing, may be used in ever new combinations to express new thoughts. In all these symbols and images the seer beholds visions which are or purport to be glimpses of the supernatural world. In many the visions are real—that is, the seer in ecstasy has caught sight of realities which he has endeavored to convey to his fellowmen in concrete forms which more or less accurately correspond to the truths he has received. Even here the personality and the preconceptions of the seer must, it would seem, determine the nature and outlines of the vision, however otherwise objective—just as the Blessed Virgin must have appeared to a mediaeval Italian, not as a Jewish peasant, but in the garb and with the features made familiar to us in the paintings of the great artists. The exile in Patmos beheld the mighty angel who came down from heaven, not as Fra Angelico might have seen him, but after the Hebrew conception “clothed with a cloud and a rainbow was upon his head, and his face as it were the sun, and his feet as pillars of fire.” It was thus that when he was permitted a vision of the paradise of God he painted for us the blessed joys which lie beyond all present human understanding, in colors used long before by the prophet Ezekiel.

The vocabulary—if you will, the conventions—of apocalyptic extend even to numbers and names. Babylon and Armageddon, Gog and Magog, figure in Old Testament and New, in canonical and in apocryphal apocalypses. To anyone familiar with these books the constant recurrence in Revelation of certain numbers, seven, twelve, four, will appear to need little explanation. The enigmatical “number of the beast,” 666, will be recognized as having its counterpart elsewhere. The “three years and a half,”

the "forty and two months," the "twelve hundred and threescore days," even the "thousand years" of the binding of Satan and of the reign of Christ and His saints, will not be made the data for involved mathematical calculations regarding the end of the world and the duration of a supposed earthly kingdom. The informed exegete will not even suppose that the numbers in Revelation necessarily apply to the same persons or events or periods as were intended in some older book in the Bible, for he understands that they are symbols, hieroglyphs, which may be used in new connections and with new significance.

For guidance in the interpretation of the symbols the student will turn first to the seer's own time, even while he recognizes that he has here only an imperfect key and that eternal truths and permanent lessons lie beneath the allusions to contemporary events. Thus the visions of Daniel were called forth by the tyranny and persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, the desolation of Jerusalem, the profanation of the temple, and the fierce Maccabean struggle for liberty. Behind the splendid pictures of victorious Saints and hymning multitudes, of hideous monsters and dreadful plagues, of the fall of great Babylon and the descent from heaven of the Holy City, we may perceive the foes, the conflicts and the triumphs of the Apostolic age. Jewish hostility, Christian faint-heartedness and luke-warmness, magical rites and Gnostic sects, the rising tide of emperor worship, the mad presumption of Caligula, the bloody cruelties of Nero and Domitian, the crowds that lived for lust and greed, the hosts of barbarians who hung as a constant threat on the borders of the empire; these, and the little churches of Asian cities, their inner troubles, their members poor and despised, the fear under which they lay and the savage persecutions which laid them waste, the secret gatherings for eucharist and prayer, all these constitute the background and in some degree the explanation of the Revelation. The message of John, like the messages of Isaiah and Ezekiel, was in the first place for the men of his own time. The message for us is in the spiritual and abiding truths to which he gave momentary application in a form familiar to the men of that day. That they have this permanent value is evident from the fact that the Church has ever prized this book among her richest treasures, in spite of the misinterpretation and fanatical abuse to which it has been subject.

On one point let us be clear. We have here no "history written in advance" under the form of prophecy. Revelation is not a collection of riddles, which when correctly solved will give the lucky guesser information regarding the future course of human affairs. The elaborate and painful calculation by which men have fancied they could predict with exactness the end of all earthly things; the ingenuity which discovers here forecasts of steam-engine, telegraph and airplane; the labored argumentation by which successive generations of controversialists have tried to prove the beast to be Mohammed, or the Pope, or Cromwell, or Napoleon, or lately Kaiser Wilhelm—are all a waste of time and trouble. All alike are based on an entire misconception of the document with which they are dealing. "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned."

Vocations for the Priesthood

(A Layman's Point of View)

ROBERT SPENCER RAYSON, M.A.

THE problem of recruiting the ranks of the ministry is one of the most pressing questions the church has to face today.

Bishops and other dignitaries in a position to know unite in sounding a warning about the falling attendance at theological colleges and seminaries. The church press abounds in discussions of the problem, very few of which, however, have gone to the real root of the matter. Among other plans there has been advocated a restoration of the permanent diaconate and a larger use of lay readers, but that is only "first aid," a temporary glazing over of a situation that is yearly becoming worse. The shortage today is not one of deacons and lay readers, but of priests, and priests alone can supply the deficiency.

Nor is the question one of mere quantity, but of quality also. If the church is to be well served, her priests must be spiritually-minded. There is no sadder sight than to see an unspiritual man ministering in the things of the Spirit, nor is there a greater source of weakness to the church. The type of recruit must be the very best; that is a *sine qua non*. In other words, in addition to the all-important qualification of spiritual-mindedness, he should be well educated, a gentleman in the best sense of that much abused

word, one who can think clearly, and act wisely on occasion, a capable administrator, and above all a man with a real and deep sense of his own shortcomings and limitations. The criticism is almost sure to be raised that that particular type of man is not common, and the criticism is true. Yet the fact remains that some such type must be kept continually in mind by those who seek to recruit the priesthood, the type portrayed in books like Newbolt's "Speculum Sacerdotum" or Carey's "My Priesthood." An ideal is useful only as long as it is not attained; no man can be expected to be the perfect priest, for in human history there has been but One Who achieved the ideal.

, Let us examine the facts of the case as it stands at present honestly, whether they be pleasant or unpleasant. As matters are now the ranks of the clergy are chiefly recruited from two classes. The first consists of men with a high sense of vocation and of their own unworthiness, who are driven into the priesthood, almost against their will, by the irresistible power of their inward call. They are men who may well say, with St. Paul, "Woe is me if I preach not the Gospel." They become the leaders in the church, mighty in its councils, heads of its colleges, the guiding force and driving power of all its activities. The other class (and one writes the words with regret) consists of those who would fail in any profession, and who merely drift into Holy Orders. True, such men are not without a sense of vocation, but neither are they without a real appreciation of social advantages accruing to the position, and a feeling that here is a living, even though a modest one, which would be impossible in any other walk of life. They form one of the greatest weaknesses of the Church, and the "man in the street," not being accustomed to differentiate between the man and the institution of which he is an official, unthinkingly condemns both, and no amount of talk about the sanctity of the office can alter his conviction.

"When religion," says Kant, "seeks to shelter itself behind its sanctity, and law behind its majesty, they justly awaken suspicion against themselves, and lose all claim to the sincere respect which reason yields only to that which has been able to bear the test of its free and open scrutiny." There, right or wrong, speaks the modern spirit, and willy-nilly the Church must reckon with it and meet successfully the keen probings of its criticism if her useful-

ness (humanly speaking) is to continue. This restless spirit of enquiry and impatience with inefficiency permeates every class today, educated and uneducated alike; never was there such an intolerant contempt for anything smacking of hypocrisy and that greatest of all crimes, failure, as there is now. Well-instructed Churchmen may be fully aware that there is such a thing as supernatural grace conferred on men in Holy Orders, but the average man, whose shallow omniscience of things religious is only too often gathered from a superficial observation of failures, hears talk of any such thing with impatient scorn and dismisses it as humbug.

In the Church's best interests her priests must be able to meet the hostile critic on his own ground and prove that his demands are already satisfied. He is the man who must be won over to the cause of Christianity. Your ordinary layman will remain loyal to the Church irrespective of his personal like or dislike for his rector; he is of the ninety and nine who are comparatively easy to manage, but the shepherds must be men who can brave the dangers of the wilderness in search of the lost sheep and restore them to the fold. The uninstructed layman, with little or no idea of what the Church stands for; with a hazy notion that it doesn't much matter what Church, if any, a man belongs to, since "all are going the same way;" with the idea dinned into his ears by clever anti-Christians that the Church, its organization outworn and its ceremonial obsolete, has outlived its usefulness, is only going to be attracted to it, in the first place, by the personality of the clergyman. His choice of a church to attend is often decided primarily by the preaching; a single poor sermon may, and very often does, drive him away. After he is caught and held more solid reasons for loyalty to the Church can be substituted for the more personal ones; an idea of the Church, not as a respectable social club, but as the Body of Christ can be built up; he can be gradually brought to see the difference between what the Church has to offer the sinner and what other bodies of Christians can give, but the original bait—the point is so important as to demand repetition—is the personality of the preacher. We have in the past so emphasized the non-importance of the individual compared with the Divine authority of the system that there has been a tendency to overlook this important aspect of the problem. The situation is not ideal, but it must be faced.

The objection may be raised, not without reason, that the kind of man who can satisfy such exacting requirements is very unusual. Men of strong and commanding personality do not grow on gooseberry bushes, and if Church work to be more successful requires that type, why, so much the worse for Church work. Yet, granted that the highest results may be obtained thus, there still remains a large field for the average man. All the world recognizes brilliance and force of character, but no less surely it recognizes the fact of simple goodness. Many a man of average scholarship and average ability, who perhaps deems himself not good enough for the priesthood, could do splendid work for Christ if only he possesses that all-important virtue.

One great reason why young men are not volunteering in sufficient numbers today is to be found in the fact that the call is not sounded in their ears with sufficient vigour and clearness. This does not mean that there are not enough sermons preached on the vocation of the ministry, though if there were more such it might play no small part in bettering affairs. What is meant is that as society is now organized there are other occupations dangling their tempting offers of money and power and worldly position before men's eyes. Science, law, medicine—all these offer big prizes to an ambitious man, and in the fierce competition among the professions the Church's call to service is easily outshouted. The world has not much use for the still small voice in this age of newspaper and magazine advertising; it treats it with scant respect, but if properly used that same voice may become a more potent and penetrating influence than all the brass band methods now so much in vogue.

The call must be sounded in two ways to be effective. No man should become a candidate for Holy Orders unless he is firmly convinced that God is calling him; without the inward call entering the ministry is worse than useless. But a quiet, aggressive campaign of information could do much towards opening the ears of likely men to the call.

In the first place it is necessary to explode some of the popular fallacies that still surround the idea of the priesthood. One of the chief of these is that it has not enough really hard work in it to occupy an active man's full time. "Easy money," and "Not a real man's job," are some of the unthinking criticisms passed by those

who only see the surface of things. Many who never see the priest except when he is in the pulpit for twenty minutes on a Sunday morning carelessly, but naturally, assume that that is the week's tale of bricks. They adopt the same attitude as the Scotch elder who found his minister accidentally fallen into a pit. "Ah weel, mon, dinna worry. This is only Wednesday afternoon and ye'll no be wantit till the Sawbath." Those who have had the privilege of working with the Church's clergy arrive at a juster estimate of their work. "That is the hardest working man in K—," remarked a Methodist once to the writer, referring to a curate in an Ontario city; "he's out of his house and at work every day before eight o'clock." The mask of the pulpit and the Sunday service must be drawn aside to a certain extent, so that the average layman can realize that preaching and Sunday work form, after all, only a part of the priest's work. One who sees something of the continual battle against sin in all its forms waged by the conscientious priest can well understand why so many men break down at a comparatively early age.

Whence then does this misapprehension come? Doubtless it lies in this, that whereas the ordinary business man is ruled by an external time-table the priest largely makes his own. He is not confined to an office all day, or continually watched by a foreman to prevent slacking; he does not slave over a bank ledger or dole out merchandise over a counter. Because his office is a whole parish, and because his foreman is his own conscientiousness the unthinking are liable to assume that neither office nor foreman exist. Moreover, the example set by that *rara avis*, a lazy priest, can do incalculable harm; and as long as a priest has so much in his hands the disposal of his time there will be peculiar force in the temptation to laziness.

But these fallacies are not invincible; like bubbles of every sort they collapse at the first touch of the pin-point of truth, and the truth today is beginning to make headway against the mass of popular prejudice and misunderstanding that still exists. The most potent agency for recruiting the ministry today, and for getting rid of the pernicious misapprehensions about priestly work, is a skilfully presented, forcible, direct exposition of what that work really is. This presentation is solely a work for the clergy themselves, one that laymen should not attempt to handle. No dentist

would dream of laying down the law about naval strategy to an expert, and no lawyer would lecture on anatomy to a medical congress. Here particularly should the rule apply of the cobbler sticking to his last.

Yet a word as to how the call should be presented may not be amiss, though advice that is offered for nothing is often worth no more. One would think that preaching on the work of the ministry would be a most delicate task; unless it were carefully handled it might sound horribly like "touting," and nobody likes touting. Yet it is not to be flinched from because of its awkwardness, and it may be that God will use this means of enlarging our lay vision and raising our ideals of the priestly life more in the future. More effective work could possibly be done in the ordinary round of parochial life by the word spoken in season and that most effective of all agents, the unobtrusive but ever present example. That, after all, is what will open the ears of our young men to hear the voice of God.

But if the direct explanation of priestly life and priestly work is essentially a task for priests, let us not go away with the idea that the work is completed. The laity have their share to do, and an important share at that. A story is told of a certain layman notorious for his strictures on the clergy who was once harping on his favourite theme to a bishop. The clergy were not gentlemen, poor scholars, not men of the world, not spiritually minded, and so on *ad nauseam*. The bishop listened patiently for awhile, but at last the worm turned.

"My dear sir, don't be too hard on us. Remember we have only the laity to draw from."

The anecdote strikes home. After all, the tasks of finding recruits for the ministry is a layman's task, inasmuch as the clergy are ultimately ordained and consecrated laymen. It might almost be stated as if it were a mathematical problem; the supply of ordinands is in a direct ratio to the idealism of the laity. Where ideals and spirituality are swamped by materialism, there the supply falls off. That is what lies at the root of the whole problem; modern society is steeped in materialism. We think money, we talk money; we acclaim the moneyed man as a success and regard the poor as failures. The influence of thousands of homes and many schools, though unconsciously, perhaps, is on the side of the exalta-

tion of money and its power. Children, when being urged to train themselves for success, nearly always have it interpreted to them in terms of money. Parents do not often, it is true, attack the idea of the priesthood as a profession for their children; it is much simpler never to mention it as a possibility. "It is a worthy calling, but I would not consider it for my boys," is the mental attitude of many a father who honestly believes himself a loyal churchman. Add to such a home atmosphere the thousand and one subtle influences of the environment of society, and a frame of mind is created not always advantageous to the Church. On an observant child, trained to regard money as essential to happiness, the sight of the rector of a wealthy parish trudging his rounds on foot stamps itself deep.

One sees a tendency to belittle the priesthood on every side, not least in current literature and drama. We are too familiar with the type of play that portrays its cleric as kind-hearted and well-meaning, "but *entre nous*, my dear chap, a bit of an ass!" In the present-day novel, how often we see the priest portrayed as a sanctimonious, oily self-seeker, "pi," in the phraseology of the English public school boy, while the really religious, conscientious man always resigns his Orders and takes to Socialistic journalism! Doubtless such types exist, just as a certain number of "bar-tender" doctors and "shyster" lawyers exist; even among the Apostles there was an Iscariot. But if the unprejudiced reader recalls to his mind the large number of priests he has known, he will doubtless remember the great majority as hard-working, faithful, highly respected men of God, not superhumanly perfect, but as a body averaging remarkably high.

It is not hard to see the conditions underlying the present shortage of ordination candidates; it is a far harder task to try and prescribe a remedy. Yet not to make the attempt, however inadequate its results may seem, is to fail in a duty incumbent upon every loyal Churchman. We have, in the first place, to begin with ourselves by tearing down the shrine of the great god Business in our hearts and on the ruins planting the Cross of the Crucified. Not all of us are called to the ministry; true, many might hear the call if only they unstopped their ears a while and listened, but the fact must be recognized that the call is for comparatively few. Yet

the question of clerical supply is one in which all have a vital interest.

Perhaps the first essential is to create an atmosphere favorable to hearing the call. Experts in advertising are fully aware of the importance of this step. In selling goods one has to ensure a favorable hearing for the salesman. The atmosphere can be formed in many ways; discussion of the problem in the press and periodicals helps; dedication of their children to the priesthood by parents can help even more. Samuel was not allowed to grow up in ignorance of religion and then to "choose for himself;" he was dedicated from his earliest years, and his mother's influence was unhesitatingly thrown into the balance. Another, and from a lay point of view a vital step is to better the financial status of the ministry, to make it a more attractive calling. Of course such a suggestion at once calls down a storm of criticism to the effect that the clergy should be willing to sacrifice themselves: the old cheap sneer of "the loaves and the fishes" is sure to be heard. Fears that a poorer quality of ordinands would offer themselves are sure to be expressed. Yet, granting the truth of the criticism and fears, the fact remains. Young men in large numbers will not enter the priesthood so long as less than a living wage, with a home for the aged at the end of it, is a certainty. It is perfectly true that the clergy should be self-sacrificing. By force of circumstances they are. But sauce for the clerical goose is equally sauce for the lay gander; the self-sacrifice of the pew should parallel that of the pulpit. If men are really in earnest about the value of the Church and her ministrations they will be willing to sacrifice a good deal to ensure that those ministrations are maintained. What one cannot help feeling at the present time is that the catchword of self-sacrifice for the clergy is only too often used as a pretext for saving the pockets of the laity. In an age when so much is being talked about equality let us have equality of sacrifice as well.

All this brings us back to our former point—that the first and last enemy to be destroyed is Materialism, the death of the soul, for unless he is engaged at close quarters a larger supply of priests for the Church will remain a pious aspiration. Materialism of mind and soul is the underlying cause of the present unsatisfactory financial status of the clergy and the chief deterrent to improvement. Once that is firmly realized, once its overthrow is begun

in the hearts and minds of the laymen and laywomen who form the great bulk of the Church Militant, victory is already assured, for the Body of Christ can never ultimately be defeated.

The Spiritual Value of Holy Communion

REV. A. Q. BAILEY, B.D.

THE value of a thing depends upon the use to which it is or may be put. A hundred twenty-dollar gold pieces on a desert island would not be worth two gull's eggs if the latter were all the food on the island and one were starving. A Steinway grand piano with no one to play it would not be worth as much as a fifteen-dollar phonograph run by a child, if music were the prime consideration. Having ready at your hand anything of intrinsic value, the question of actual value depends upon the use to which it is put.

This is true of the spiritual as of the material: both must be used in order to secure results; and the greater the intelligent use of one or of the other the greater the results and the benefits. Therefore an intelligent use of any given spiritual factor in life will make that spiritual factor of greater power and efficiency; in other words, of greater benefit both to the user and to others.

The Holy Communion is such a spiritual power. Are we using it?

Why do you go to the Holy Communion? Men will give this question various answers. It is my duty: I count it a privilege: I go to be helped: I love the service. Other and sometimes better answers are given as men think of their relation to that Sacrament. Is there a reason that goes to the root of things? I ask you to look for a moment at the Prayer Book and see if we cannot find there the fundamental devotional reason for going to the Holy Communion, and an intimation, if not a statement, of the use to which the Holy Communion is to be put.

First, then, I do not believe that the Holy Communion can take the place which it ought to occupy in your life without conscious and active faith in and acceptance of the truth of the Real Presence of Christ in that Sacrament. Now do not shy off at this statement, thinking that I am laying down a definition of the Real Presence for

your acceptance. Definitions of how, when, etc., have caused a great deal of difficulty and disbelief in more than one essential element of Christian truth. So just take your Prayer Book and turn to the Catechism which you once knew by heart, so far as the words are concerned, and take a look this time at what the words really say.

In answer to the question, "What meanest thou by this word *Sacrament*?" the words say: "I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us—." Very well; nothing can be given to us which is not there. But to go on: "—ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same (*i. e.* the grace) and a pledge to assure us (*i. e.* make us sure) thereof." In other words, the bread and the wine are the means whereby we receive the grace, which is really there, and the outward sign is given to us to make sure that it is real.

But what is this grace? Or, to use the words of the Catechism, "What is the inward part, or thing signified?" *Answer.* "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are spiritually taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." Now it is not permitted to interpret *spiritually* to mean *in an imaginary or unreal way*, which seems to be the conception of many in regard to it. It is the adverbial form of a word which has a definite and distinct meaning of its own "having to do with the spirit." In other words, the key to it is furnished by the answer to that other question of the Catechism, "What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?" which are "The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine." You know that your bodies are strengthened and refreshed, if ever so little, by the Bread and the Wine. These elements are the "means" or intermediary whereby, or through which, our souls are strengthened by the Body and Blood of Christ which is the grace of which they are the outward and visible sign. This grace is real and, as the Catechism says, is "given unto us" thereby.

This is the meaning of the Church's words in her Catechism. You have known them ever since you were a child: did they mean this to you before? You ask me to explain how this can be. I cannot do it. Nobody can. I could talk to you about it for a long time and would delight in doing so: but I cannot explain it. It is merely a simple statement of what the Church has always believed and taught—that in the Holy Communion Jesus Christ Her Lord is

present in the midst of His people in a way which He Himself provided and in a manner of presence which is different from His omnipresence as God; a Presence which is only true and real at this time and in this manner. We call it His Sacramental Presence. We do not explain it; we just accept it: and if we are wise we leave the way in which He is able to and does do this thing to Him Who alone can know it in any case because it takes place in the realm of the spiritual into which the human mind cannot yet penetrate. But the spiritual fact of His Presence is the all-important fact in the Church's life, and in your life.

The quoted "Comfortable Words" of Christ and the following words of the Apostles take on new meaning as we kneel before the Altar and look for His coming in that Sacrament: "Come unto me, all ye that travail and are heavy laden, and I will refresh you."—"This is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, That Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners." We are sinners and we are going to Him at His bidding to be saved, refreshed and strengthened.

Fundamentally, therefore, the Presence of Christ in the Holy Communion is the reason for our going to that service, not forgetting, of course, His command to "Do this—" which of itself, as a divine command, should compel our attendance: but I am speaking devotionally, not of obedience. If, then, we recognize the Presence as the power which draws us continually to the Altar of God (and who can resist it once the truth is recognized and accepted), what is the purpose with which we go? Given the Presence, why do we seek It?

The answer is two fold. It is found in the Prayer of Consecration. The beginning and the ending of that prayer give the key note of the first purpose. "All glory be to thee, Almighty God—" we say; and ending, we add; "by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honor and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end." We go, we must go, to worship: the Church puts worship first, last and all the time both here and throughout the service. We go also, and the Church is very careful to lay stress on the fact, "that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood—" and "that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion may—be filled with (God's) grace and heavenly

benediction—that (Christ) may dwell in us and we in him.” In other words, worship of God through Jesus Christ and help for man from Jesus Christ are the purposes for which the Church celebrates the Holy Communion. Both these should find their place in our hearts and minds also as we draw near to the Presence of Christ in the “Sacrament of the Altar.”

But which first? It is natural that weak and sinful and needy man should think of help first. We need it badly, and the realization of the Presence of Christ in this service will draw us there frequently for it. Let us then consider this element of the Holy Communion first.

Jesus Christ came into the world to do something for man which man could not do for himself. The purpose of His coming is announced by the angel who foretold it.—“He shall save his people from their sins.” If we believe in Jesus Christ it is idle for us to think that we can save ourselves from our own sins: we must be saved by Him. But how are we to receive the help He came to bring? He is no longer upon earth: and upon the Cross He said “It is finished.” His work was done. What has He left for us who live today? The Church, of course. What do you suppose the Church is for if not to be the means through which He gives us that help? Why are you baptized except that from Him you may “have power and strength to have victory, and to triumph, against the devil, the world, and the flesh?” Why are you confirmed but that you may be strengthened “with the Holy Ghost, the Comforter” whom He sent into the world on Whitsun Day to carry on His work? What does it mean that you receive Christ Himself within you in the Holy Communion, being “made one body with him, that he may dwell in us, and we in him” but that He comes to you to do for you what He came to do for the world—save you from your sins since you cannot save yourself but need His “power and strength to have victory”? Can you neglect this gift? Can you remain away? Only as you fail to recognize your sins or boldly count yourself able to conquer in your own strength, which no man has yet been able to do; or, thirdly, because you do not know what a wonderful and beautiful and real and true communion with God is the Sacrament of His Body and Blood. The realization and acceptance of the truth of His Presence sends us at once humbly to kneel before Him to

receive the forgiveness of our sins and strength to conquer temptation in the coming days. This is your Communion.

But what of Him? Is this all? Shall we get only and not give? The Church says No: our own hearts say No. We will not get only, we will give also. But what can we give? We have no worthy offering; we cannot even give ourselves for "we are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table." It is true: we are not worthy. And yet we do give ourselves. Right in the midst of the Consecration Prayer, when we have said we are unworthy and He is here, we do "offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and living sacrifice unto thee—" What does it mean? Let me try to tell you.

In the old days when the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross was prefigured and typified by the animal sacrifices of the Jews, no animal with a blemish was permitted to be offered: it must be without spot. This, of course, represented the perfect sacrifice of Christ. Moreover, the essence of the sacrifice was the shedding of the blood: as the Epistle to the Hebrews says, "without shedding of blood is no remission." Now as God had said in the beginning to Adam, "the flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat." So also to the Jews at the time of the Exodus, when the laws of sacrifice were laid down, the same regulation was made: they were not to eat the blood; the sprinkling of the blood was an essential part of the sacrifice. In other words the sacrifice which is acceptable to God is the life, of which the outpoured blood is the symbol. Now the death of Christ upon the Cross, in which he sacrificed His life for men, was "a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world" and therefore animal sacrifices have ceased and we have no sacrifice to offer but that. And so we meet together and our Lord comes to us in the Holy Communion under "an outward and visible sign" which represents to the eye and spiritually is, the broken Body and shed Blood of the Christ, "we, thy humble servants, do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make—" What we are doing is to offer to God the Sacrifice of the Cross, the Christ, once and once for all offered for the sins of the world: "—although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this

our bounden duty and service—" Whatever theory of consecration the theologians may evolve, our worship in the Holy Communion is offering and presenting before God the Sacrifice of His Son. And it is in union with Him, "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world" that we "offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee—" We can do that, can we not? We can come before God because "we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous; and he is the Propitiation for our sins" and we can, because we are members of Christ, join ourselves consciously with Him and offer ourselves, not as sinners but as redeemed from sin in Him, and then go forth from each Communion, with His strength, to live the redeemed life.

These two elements there are, then, in the Church's wonderful Holy Communion service. First the worship of God, which is positive and objective; in which we present before God the Sacrifice of His Son for the sins of the world, and upon the basis of that Sacrifice plead for the forgiveness of our sins and the sins of all men. Secondly, the receiving of grace for the cleansing of the sins in ourselves for which we plead and strength to fight temptation in the future.

Therefore we do not go to the Holy Communion without definite preparation. As we are going for the forgiveness of our sins, we will go with our sins known and recognized and acknowledged by careful self-examination to which the Church bids us in the exhortation, that we "examine (our) lives and conversations by the rule of God's Commandments—" Read that exhortation in full for yourself as it follows the Collects after the Communion service in the Prayer Book. The Church knew, when she put those words there, why you should do that thing. It is one of the elements in an intelligent practical use of the Holy Communion.

Next: we are going into the Presence of Christ and we are to make use of that spiritual fact in an act not only of worship and adoration but of petition. We will not, therefore, be selfish in that time of petition: we will make it also an act of intercession; *i. e.*, of prayer for others. Is there any place where we can bring those for whom we would pray closer to God than the very Presence of Christ? Look at the Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church militant: all its petitions look forward to the presence of Christ

and originally were joined in one common prayer with the Prayer of Consecration: it is the Church's precept of prayer for others at the Holy Communion service. Look at the latter part of the Prayer of Consecration as it stands: that "we, and all thy whole Church obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion"—"that we, and all others who shall be partakers of this Holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son, Jesus Christ, be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with him—." The Church knows; and she has set before us the Holy Communion as the time of the deepest spiritual contact with God in which to bring all that concerns human welfare to Him.

This is the Holy Communion: this is its use. Why not make it, as it was intended to be when our Lord gave it to us, and it alone, and said "Do this—" why not make it, I say, the center of our devotion, the well-spring of our spiritual life?

What else can give such strength and power, such inspiration to draw near to God!

NOTE: If you have not a book of devotion for use at the Holy Communion presenting the service in this way, with suitable prayers for use to give expression to this attitude toward it, your rector will doubtless be glad to suggest one. Hymn 228 (New Hymnal 333) is illuminating in this connection.

BOOK REVIEWS

The Life of Christ. By the Rev. R. J. Campbell, D. D., New York. Appletons, 1921; pp. xiii+438.

It must be confessed that the first impression made by this book is a trifle disappointing. It may be that we expect too much—we naturally expect a great deal from its author, who is the widely known and honored one-time preacher at City Temple, London, now an Anglican priest and Vicar of Christ Church, Westminster. Thousands who have read his earlier books, especially his autobiographic *Spiritual Pilgrimage*, will turn eagerly to this volume.

But the publishers have unfairly announced it as “a record of all that modern scholarship can tell of the Life of Jesus”—whereas four hundred and fifty pages cannot, of course, more than barely begin to tell “all.” And in the second place, the author himself explains in his preface that the book was written at his publishers’ request—a rather unpromising beginning.

Moreover, there occur little slips which betray the author’s unfamiliarity with the *minutiae* of N. T. study. These are scarcely worth listing, and will trouble no one but the specialist. More serious is the use made of the Fourth Gospel in reconstructing the outline of our Lord’s life. It is really doubtful if “modern scholarship,” quite so unanimously as Dr. Campbell appears to assume, accepts the historical character of the fundamental narrative of this writing. Sanday did, in his lectures at Union Seminary (*The Criticism of the Fourth Gospel*). But those lectures are eighteen years old (1904); and before his lamented death the master of British N. T. scholarship announced his advance beyond that position.

Finally, Dr. Campbell lacks sympathy with Judaism. This is no doubt due to unfamiliarity with the literature and the spirit of that religion. Criticisms occur—*e. g.*, “The religious leaders of Israel were destroying all that the Temple was supposed to embody and express . . . ” (p. 170)—but scarce one word of appreciation is to be found. Sanday long ago, in his “Outlines,” showed to English-reading students of the life of Christ the existence of a brighter side to first-century Judaism than it was the fashion, up to the end of the XIXth century, to recognize. This is a serious handicap in writing the life of Jesus, the most significant religious teacher Judaism ever knew, the “teacher come from God” who took over Jewish religious ideas and habits of thought in His teaching even as He took Jewish flesh and blood at His incarnation. And those religious ideas include much more than the “terminology of apocalyptic.”

These are our chief criticisms. But what interests us first of all is the

high apologetic value of the work. If space permitted, we should be glad to quote entire pp. 149-151, a marvellous pen-portrait or characterization of the Master, and pp. 410f, the concluding paragraph of the book. Let the book-taster turn to these pages at once in some nearby library or quiet shop, and he will buy or borrow in order to read the rest!

The general point of view from which the book is written is that of ultra-modern idealism: there is a real supernatural order—elsewhere he calls this “the state in which God and His angels dwell, the realm of all-perfection . . . the Kingdom of God or the Kingdom of Heaven . . . the *summum bonum* of which all great dreamers have dreamed, the eternally real which is also the ideally perfect, the good to which nothing can be added, that which is as contrasted with all that merely seems” (p 136f). This supernatural order breaks through into the natural, again and again; for the natural order (if we may be allowed to paraphrase what seems to be Dr. Campbell’s meaning) is only the surface of the supernatural, that part of the eternal order which is continually, generally but transiently presented to us. The life of Jesus, His appearance, His “mighty works” constitute the most eventful “breaking through” in all history; He is the strongest evidence which has even been given of the existence of such an order (p. 16).

It follows from this high idealistic and apologetic point of approach that

“It is the Jesus presented to us in the continuous experience of the living Church with whom we have acquaintance, not a Jesus disinterred from written records. If the Church could have been blotted out of existence, and all knowledge of its teachings and institutions have disappeared as completely as, say, the religion of Mithras, and we were rediscovering the New Testament and reading its contents, there would be little need to discuss the person of Jesus: He would have no reality for us. It may be questioned whether many people realize how true this is or how little dependent we are upon the printed page after all for what we know of Jesus. We know Him mainly and immediately through the life of the Church and then we go to the printed page with that conception of Him in our minds and find it there also; in fact the Jesus of the gospels and epistles is the projection of the experience of the apostolic Church . . . We know Jesus in the New Testament because we already know Him in the light of the living tradition.” (p. 19f).

This is strongly put. We can only add that it is not put one whit too strongly; for the soundest of recent historical investigation of the N. T. literature not only proves these statements but takes them for granted in pressing research still further.

There is some fine writing—we expect this also from Dr. Campbell. The shepherds near Bethlehem were holding a “prayer meeting under the

stars" when the angelic message was heard. Joseph went to Bethlehem in order to "attest" certain family property in that village. The Sermon on the Mount was not a sermon, but the hurried notes jotted down day after day at a "summer school of religion held in the open air on the summit of a Galilean hill," during several weeks. "Q" represents Matthew's notes on these daily lectures; and the disagreements between Luke's and Matthew's versions of the Sermon are traceable to two sets of notes written down by two different students in this school. There are whole pages of such pure fancy, charmingly written, fascinating.

The deeper questions of the literary phenomena of the gospels, or of chronology, or of the length of Jesus' ministry, scarcely come in view. The work is thus no great advance on earlier lives of Christ, a fact which indicates, no doubt, the extreme inertia of popular theology, and the slowness with which a new point of view is gained and assimilated. It is a task for generations. But the new point of view is here, if it is not wholly assimilated; the book is modern, if moderate. Beyond doubt, it is the best popular Life of Christ today. Its apologetic value is very high, though perhaps marred by too much confidence in the results of psychic investigation, and the apparent admission that the Angels of Mons were real and not fictitious (all the world knows they were fiction). The truly great, consummate Life of Christ has not yet appeared. Sanday's might have been it, had he lived. That Life will require vast research as its preliminary; a perfect command of the materials and tools of the historical and literary investigation of the N. T., the contemporary, earlier and later Jewish literature; a genius, insight into and sympathy with the religious life, aye, the everyday life of Palestine in the first century; it will require a perfect balance of the critical and the devotional points of view; a mastery of style, of the clear expression in the author's own language of completely lucid thought, together with charm and a fitting beauty of diction.

But who is sufficient unto these things? Campbell has marvellous gifts, for which multitudes of us have long loved and honored him. He has vigor, clarity, beauty of style; he has faith, and idealism; he has a wide acquaintance with the modern literature of his subject; he has the spiritual gift of interpretation, and his book will do an immense amount of good. It is remarkable that a popular preacher could read so widely and keep so closely in touch with modern Biblical scholarship—even though he lacks certain advantages which can only be gained after wearying and prolonged examination of the N. T. data, the careful weighing of each word and phrase of the gospels, the most painstaking and thorough

familiarization with the literature and religion of contemporary Judaism. But let us be thankful for what we have! It is a magnificent book!

FREDERICK C. GRANT.

The Origin of Paul's Religion, by J. Gresham Machen, D. D. The Macmillan Co., 1921.

We thank Dr. Machen heartily for these interesting and valuable lectures, which grapple directly with the most pressing problems of the day. For the real point at issue is wider and more vital than that indicated in the title of the book. It concerns the origin, not of St. Paul's religion only but of the Christian religion as a whole, and it involves the all-important question as to the true nature of its Founder. Was Jesus Christ incarnate God, or was He but a Jewish teacher with a conception of God and of righteousness somewhat higher and clearer than that of other rabbis of His time? Has historic Christianity any true connection with the Man of Nazareth? Or is it the resultant of the varying speculations, beliefs and cults of oriental lands? Dr. Machen has no doubts regarding the answers to be made to these questions, but their absence is not due to ignorance or lack of thought. He knows whereof he writes, the ancient authors, and the modern antagonists from Wrede and J. Weiss to Bousset and Lake. He sympathizes as little with the older "liberal" school as with the later and acuter critics, who discredit the Markan account as well as the Johannine, and he concedes nothing to either.

Perhaps at times he does not seem to recognize the strength of objections, and to have too ready a solution for every difficulty. Certainly he fails to give full weight to the sacramental teaching of St. Paul, minimizes his eschatology, and rejects too confidently and sweepingly all influence of the mystery religions on his terminology. There is a certain flavor of old-fashioned orthodox Protestantism in many places. But these faults detract little from the value of the book, which furnishes the intelligent reader with just the facts and arguments needed to strengthen him against the anti-Christian polemic of the day.

The Princeton professor is not only a scholar, but he also writes in a vigorous, clear, and epigrammatic style. It is not often that a serious theological work has so much "punch." We commend it especially to all who have been reading Morgan's "Religion and Theology of Paul," or who have been troubled by Lake and Jackson's "Beginnings of Christianity."

C. C. E.

The Work of the Church Among the Mormons. By the Rev. Jesse Herbert Dennis, B. D. Milwaukee. Morehouse, 1921.; pp. 41 (Paper).

In the Hale Memorial Sermon for 1921 the former Rector of St. Paul's Church, Salt Lake City, has given the Church a brief yet comprehensive survey both of Mormonism and the Church's work among its votaries. The preacher has had ample opportunity to study both at first hand, so that he can speak with authority. For many years we have been personally interested in this subject and have read considerably along these lines; and we are both astonished and delighted in seeing the grasp Mr. Dennis has of his subject, which enables him to treat it satisfactorily in such brief compass as this sermon.

The appendices are valuable. Especially striking is Bishop Spaulding's proof of the misinterpretation of Egyptian papyri. From our own personal study of Egyptology which we pursued for years at German universities and at home, we can testify to the accuracy of the information obtained by the Bishop. Less happy was the attempt of his successor to discredit the Book of Mormon on critical grounds, as it involved the acceptance of the so-called results of the Higher Criticism.

The sermon should be read by all who take an interest in our Home Missions.

F. C. H. W.

The Judgment of the Nations, or the Ending of Temporal Power. By Wm. Parker. Pittsburgh. Mt. Lebanon Pub. Co., 1920; pp. 234.

Across the river from our home, picturesquely situated, is a camp of the Adventists, where every year on "Prophecy Sunday," there are displayed in the Auditorium great diagrams, ornamented with dragons, and other apocalyptic beasts. Thither flock many of the faithful, and not a few of the profanely curious, to be edified, or pleasantly excited, or frightened, according to their respective temperaments. Some of the same kind of diagrams illustrate the volume before us. Perhaps they have a meaning or an appeal for some not fully instructed minds. Certain it is that both these diagrams and the arguments they are intended to illustrate seem to us rather inconclusive. The wild symbolism, the far-fetched interpretations, especially of the apocalyptic Scriptures, hardly appeal to our people. *E. g.* the ships of Chittim are interpreted as the commerce of England and America! Of course, the late great World War is the fulfillment of prophecy; and the downfall of Germany is the end of military absolutism. The interpreter even goes so far as to prophecy that on this shall follow the downfall of "commercial absolutism," "predatory wealth," "trusts," etc.

The book is orthodox in its fundamental theology. But the interpretations of the Bible are colored by the author's Adventist predilections. It is strange that the writer should—like all of his compeers—be ignorant of the fact that the Catholic Church has always laid the greatest stress on Christ's Second Advent, and seems to think that this event is the discovery of his sect! Of course, the Roman Church comes in for the usual declamatory denunciations; and, equally of course, the Greek Church does not escape a like fate. Nor is Protestantism treated much better. The whole of "organized Christianity" has evidently lain in darkness from the beginning! Misconceptions abound. Thus the "Militant Church" is the church that is bound up with the world and uses worldly methods to combat evil. Of course there is a "temporal" and a "spiritual" church—a variation of the "visible" and "invisible" churches of Protestantism. He deprecates "dogmatism;" yet his whole tone is dogmatic. His *ipse dixit* is all the proof that is needed.

Despite these errors and extravagances, there are some useful hints. The author is as much opposed to Neologies as to Catholicism. He has no use for German Theology, Higher Criticism, or Socialism. He rightly deprecates the Church's interference in politics.

To anyone desiring to have in brief compass a book on the ideas and ideals of the Adventist Movement and its arguments this volume will prove most valuable.

F. C. H. W.

Low Mass Ceremonial in accordance with the English Rite as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. By the Rev. C. P. A. Burnett. N. Y. W. Green, 1921; pp. v + 57.

The word Ritualist has come to be a term of reproach used to describe that futile and boring type of religious person who delights in the minutiae of ceremonial. The most tiresome of all ritualists is the priest who invents out of his inner consciousness strange and original ceremonies to accompany the sacred duties he must perform—the priest who is "*so dramatic at the altar.*" Fr. Burnett's little book is not intended for such as these, but rather for priests who take their priesthood seriously, who realize the awfulness of their office, who know that they handle the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and who wish to do so reverently and carefully and in accordance with the customs of the Catholic Church, and not lightly inventing novel ceremonies of their own.

From the Preface it appears that this is to take the place of Fr. McGarvey's portion of "The Ceremonies of the Mass," which is out of print

but a new edition of which is hoped for. In the mean time a small manual like this is useful. But we believe that condensation has been carried too far to leave a really practical book. To describe even very simple ceremonies minutely enough so that one who is unfamiliar can reproduce them is an almost endless task. We do not believe that a candidate for the priesthood could learn to perform correctly, with only the help of this book, all the actions Fr. Burnett prescribes.

We note a number of changes from ordinary usage and from the directions in "The Ceremonies of the Mass," and some of them puzzle us. On page 23 the celebrant, at the words "are unworthy," is told to strike his breast thrice, although on page 5 *once* is ordered—the ordinary rule. What authority is there for the celebrant rubbing his fingers over the paten (p. 24 & 25) instead of over the chalice? A pause for "meditation" is ordered after receiving from the chalice (p. 25) as well as the customary one after receiving the Host. Does Fr. Burnett really believe that he can revive the separation of the sexes at communion (p. 26)? The directions (p. 27) for veiling the Sacrament after communion require the paten to be left on the corporal instead of on the chalice, a new, and we should think awkward, arrangement. The wiping of the lips at the ablutions is omitted (p. 29). We are sorry to see the change in the wording of the prayer (p. 37) said by the priest when he has ascended to the altar.

On pages 54-5 Fr. Burnett deals with a question about which there has been considerable controversy recently, the proper time for the ablutions in our mass—whether immediately after the communion or deferred till after the blessing. He defends the latter custom. Without attempting to judge in the matter we may set down certain facts which we believe are not disputed. (1) "Ablutions" is a technical term for the ceremonial cleansing of the chalice (and sometimes the paten and ciborium) and the celebrant's fingers. (2) By the twelfth or thirteenth century this ceremony had become fixed throughout the West in practically its present form and place as now found in the Roman Missal—*i. e.*, immediately after the communion. (3) No Prayer Book of the Anglican communion has any direction whatever for the ablutions. (4) Those priests who conformed to the new order in the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth and who performed the ablutions (as presumably all who retained their Catholic belief did) undoubtedly performed this ceremony where they always had, immediately after the communion of the people, there being no new direction. (5) Some time in Elizabeth's reign the ceremony of the ablutions fell into disuse, apparently was forgotten, and was never revived until the days of the Oxford Movement. (6) Among the abuses resulting from Protestant

influence in the Church of England was the shocking irreverence with which the Body and Blood of Christ were frequently treated, what remained after the communion of the people being used as common bread and wine. (7) To stop such sacrilege the rubric "And if any remain of that which was consecrated . . ." was added in 1661, but this rubric ordered no ablutions—a ceremony then entirely disused and forgotten. (8) It is impossible to read into this rubric a command to reserve the Blessed Sacrament till after the blessing. Cosin, whom Blunt calls "the most learned ritualist among the bishops," and who is believed to have originated the new rubrics, has left a memorandum regarding the rubric "if any remain" in which he says: "if he (the celebrant) be careful . . . *none will remain.*" (9) When a disused ceremony is restored to use it is surely most reasonable to perform it, if possible, at the time and place it formerly occupied (unless, indeed, one wishes to emphasize the differences between us and other Catholics). (10) Few if any of those who argue for the deferred ablutions really obey the rubric, which orders that some of the communicants shall join the celebrant in consuming what remains of the Blessed Sacrament.

Before leaving this matter of the ablutions we wish to draw attention to two of Fr. Burnett's arguments which seem to us misleading. He quotes (without reference) words of the late Mr. Birkbeck (mis-spelled Birbeck) to the effect that in the Eastern church the ablutions are deferred. Referring to the "Service Book of the Holy Orthodox-Catholic Church (Houghton-Mifflin, 1906), pages 122-6, we find that after the deacon has consumed what remains and cleansed the chalice there follows a short blessing, then a long blessing by the bishop or the celebrant, and then three pages of post-communion prayers and hymns. This flatly contradicts Mr. Birkbeck's testimony as given by Fr. Burnett. Fr. Burnett then quotes Lockton ("The Treatment of the Remains at the Eucharist"), to show that "at Rome the custom of removing the sacrament from the altar after the communion seems to have been adopted first in the sixteenth century." Now this seems a rather surprising statement until one consults Locton (p. 242) and discovers that the passage refers to the *extra Hosts kept over for reservation* and the time at which they are to be put in the pyx or tabernacle, and has nothing whatever to do with the ablutions, which, at Rome as in England, were performed immediately after the communion long before the sixteenth century. The quotation, unexplained, is likely to be extremely misleading.

In England the Catholic clergy are trying to work together and to obtain a reasonable amount of uniformity in services. The Federation of Catholic

Priests, which engineered the great Oxford Priests' Convention last summer, has published a pamphlet, "Recommendations towards Uniformity in the Saying of Mass" (London, 1919). We recommend it to readers of the present book.

H. K. P.

Civil War in West Virginia. A story of the industrial conflict in the coal mines. By Winthrop D. Lane. New York, B. W. Huebsch, 1921; (paper) pp. 128.

This is one of the "Freeman" pamphlets issued on important subjects. It consists of reprints of a series of news articles running from February 7 to March 3, 1921, in the *New York Evening Post*, written after the author had spent a number of weeks in West Virginia. The author is one of the witnesses recently called before the Congressional committee investigating the conditions in West Virginia. The attempt is made to show the seriousness of the situation, the living conditions of the miners, their attitude and the attitude of the operators. Chief among the complaints are undue paternalism, bad mining camps, eviction and insecurity of residence, deputy sheriffs in the pay of operators, suppressions by injunction, poor wages and violence, which is present on both sides. The writer seeks to treat his material fairly. His sympathies are plainly with the workers, although he does not hesitate to admit injustice and violence at times upon the part of the laborers. He also presents some operators in a good light. It is, however, a severe arraignment of the way the mines are operated. The fairness of the pamphlet can perhaps only adequately be judged after the report of the Congressional investigation, just concluded, has been made public. If the facts set forth are one quarter true there is a great need for radical changes. The pamphlet is not inflammatory and may be of service in arousing interest in the conditions in our coal fields. At any rate the seriousness of the conflict demands an intelligent effort to ascertain the facts in the case. The problem is such that it cannot safely be ignored.

The Morality of the Strike. By Donald A. McLean, M.A., S.T.L. Preface by John A. Ryan, D.D. New York, P. J. Kennedy & Sons, 1921; pp. 189.

At a time when one hears so much of economic interpretations of history and the great stress laid upon the economic factors in daily life, it is

rather a relief to be presented with such a subject as the "Morality of the Strike." Too often such considerations are overlooked. In this book Father McLean discusses the strike in every phase and with great thoroughness. The soundness of his moral judgments is praiseworthy. His grasp of pertinent economic conditions is good. His bibliography is extensive. The entire book is stimulating and thought provoking.

A resumé of the history of the origin and development of the strike problem is first given. Prominent among the tendencies which accelerated the degradation of the laboring class is placed the sixteenth century "Reformation," due largely to the individualistic *Laissez faire* policy which the Reformation generated. The sad plight of laborers, particularly of the children in industry, during the early nineteenth century is sketched. The discussion of the strike begins with a consideration of its moral aspects in relation to the employer, the workers and society, followed by the study of the morality of the strike in relation to the end sought and the means employed to enforce strike demands.

The two concluding chapters are by far the most interesting. They treat of the sympathetic and the general strike, and of the morality of state action in relation to strike prevention. Such a discussion is particularly valuable at present when strikes are increasingly unpopular and when great numbers are coming to feel that the state should prohibit strikes after the example of Kansas. If such prohibitions are enforced, it is argued, the state must provide the fullest machinery for effectively removing the cause of industrial strife; if the state is to be justified in taking away from the employees the ordinary means of self-defense against injustice. Reference is made to the unsuccessful efforts of Australia and New Zealand to prohibit strikes by direct legislation. The author maintains the state's right to diminish causes of strikes and to prohibit strikes until there has been the endeavor to settle the differences by arbitration. The Industrial Disputes Investigation Act passed in 1907 in Canada is cited as evidence of the greater success achieved by the indirect method of strike prevention.

It is pointed out that any real remedy must strike boldly at the very root of the economic struggle. "As long as the present type of industrial system continues with the means of production and the instrumentalities of distribution almost entirely under the control of a few capitalists while the great bulk of humanity is left dependent on their daily wage, the seeds of industrial strife are bound to germinate. A system of this kind does not make adequate provision for the full development of man's personality." "Laborers must be given adequate representation in the field of produc-

tion and distribution." A reasonable amount of democracy in industry is required. Above all it must be recognized that the issues are fundamentally moral and religious, and only in the light of true philosophical and religious principles can the solution of the great problem be found.

Order for the Recitation of the Divine Office and Celebration of the Holy Sacrifice According to the English Rite: MCMXXII. London, S. S. P. P.; pp. 72. Price, 3/6; interleaved, 4/6.

All of our Catholic parishes go beyond the calendar of the Prayer Book, to some extent, in the festivals they observe. If a priest does not adopt some standard in this matter and abide by it anarchy is likely to result, choosing here and there such feasts as are personally interesting. The S. S. P. P. *Ordo* is the best that we know. It is an intelligent adaptation of the Roman calendar to make it fit with that of the Prayer Book. As with all the productions of this society, the book is beautifully printed.

BOOKS RECEIVED

A Defence of Philosophic Doubt (New Edition). An Essay of the Foundations of Belief, by Arthur James Balfour, F.R.S. Hodder & Stoughton, Limited, London, 1921; pp. vii and 355.

Low Mass Ceremonial. In accordance with the English Rite as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer. By the Rev. C. P. A. Burnett, B.D., Vicar of Holy Cross Church, New York. William Green, successor to Renwick W. Crother, New York, 1921; pp. 57.

The Anglican and Eastern Churches. A Historical Record, 1914-1921. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London, 1921; pp. 64.

Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion. By Baron Frederick von Hugel. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York, 1921; pp. xvii+308. \$6.00.

The Origin of Paul's Religion. The James Sprunt Lectures delivered at Union Theological Seminary in Virginia. By J. Greshma Machen, D.D. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1921; pp. 329.

The Work of the Church Among the Mormons. The Hale Memorial Sermon, 1921. By the Rev. Jesse Herbert Dennis, B.D. Morehouse Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1921; pp. 41.

The Social Opportunity of the Churchman. By Charles K. Gilbert and Charles N. Lathrop. Department of Christian Social Service, 281 Fourth avenue, New York, 1921; pp. 103.

The Church's Life—A Study of the Fundamentals of the Church's Mission. By William C. Sturgis, A.M., Ph.D. Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society, New York, 1920; pp. 198.

Essays—Speculative and Political. By the Rt. Hon. Arthur James Balfour, M.A., F.R.S., LL.D., D.C.L. George H. Doran's Company, New York, 1920; pp. 7 and 341.

The Ministry (The Vocational Series). By Charles Lewis Slattery. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, 1921; pp. 198. \$1.25.

A Century of Endeavor, 1821-1921. By Julia C. Emery. Department of Missions, New York, 1921; pp. 468.

The Comfort of the Catholic Faith. By the Rev Frank M. Clendenin, D.D. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1921; pp. xiv and 183.

Who Are the Members of the Church? Pusey House Occasional Papers, No. 9. By Darwell Stone, D.D., and F. W. Puller, M.A. Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1921; pp. 88. Price, 90 cents net.

The Place of the Laity in the Administration and Work of the Church. Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications, XXIII. By the Rt. Rev. J. A. Kempthorne, D.D. Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1921; pp. 33. Price, 50 cents net.

The Moral Argument for Theism. Liverpool Diocesan Board of Divinity Publications, XXIV. By the Rev. Vernon F. Storr, M.A. Longmans, Green & Co., London, 1921; pp. 59. Price, 75 cents net.

Order for the Recitation of the Divine Office and Celebration of the Holy Sacrifice According to the English Rite: MCMXXII. London, the Society of SS. Peter and Paul; pp. 72. Price, 3/6 net.

The Server's Missal. Southwark Books, I. London, Society of SS. Peter and Paul; pp. 48. Price, 1/6.

The Lambeth Diary, MCMXXII. Designed by Martin Travers. London, Society SS. Peter and Paul. Price, 4d. each.

The Canterbury Almanack, 1922. London, Society SS. Peter and Paul, 1921. Price, 4d. each.

Oremus. An Office Book for the Use of Missionary Communities and Others who Pray for India. London, Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1921; pp. 116.

Twenty-five Consecration Prayers. Translations of Christian Literature, Series III. Liturgical Texts. By Arthur Linton. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1921; pp. xiv and 145.

A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on The Book of Job, together with a new translation, *The International Critical Commentary*. By the late Samuel Rolles Driver, D.D., and George Buchanan Gray, D.Litt. In two volumes. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York, 1921, pp. lxxviii, 376; vol. II, pp. xii, 360.

The Morality of the Strike. By Rev. Donald Alexander McLean, M.A., S.T.L. P. J. Kenedy & Sons. New York, 1921, pp. 196.

Liberalism and Industry. Towards a Better Social Order. By Ramsay Muir. Houghton, Mifflin Company. Boston and New York, 1921, pp. xii, 207.

The Life of Christ. By Rev. R. J. Campbell, D.D. D. Appleton and Company, New York, 1921, pp. 286.

Foreigners or Friends. A Handbook. The Churchman's Approach to the Foreign-born and their Children. By Thomas Burgess, Charles Kendall Gilbert, Charles Thorley Bridgman. Department of Missions and Church Extension, New York, 1921, pp. 263.

Civil War in West Virginia (The Freeman Pamphlets). By Winthrop D. Lane. A Story of the Industrial Conflict in the Coal Mines. With an introduction by John R. Commons. B. W. Huebsch, Inc., New York, 1921, pp. 128.

The Pilgrim Spirit. A Pageant in celebration of the tercentenary of the Landing of the Pilgrims at Plymouth, Massachusetts, December 21, 1620. By George P. Baker. Marshall Jones Company, Boston, 1921, pp. 136.

Divorce in the New Testament. A Reply to Dr. Charles. By G. H. Box, D.D., Charles Gore, D.D. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. The Macmillan Company, New York, 1921, pp. 61.

The Judgment of the Nations or The Ending of Temporal Power. By Wm. Parker. Mt. Lebanon Publishing Co., Pittsburg, 1920, pp. 234.

The Life and Growth of Israel. A brief Old Testament History. By Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph.D., D.D. Morehouse Publishing Co., Milwaukee, 1921, pp. xvi, 170.

Henry Edward Manning—His Life and Labours. By Shane Leslie, M.A. P. J. Kenedy & Sons, New York, 1921, pp. xxiii and 514.

The Sacraments. By Francis J. Hall, D.D. Longmans, Green & Co. New York, 1921, pp. xv and 331

Men of Might. Studies of Great Characters. By A. C. Benson and H. F. W. Tatham. Longmans, Green & Co., New York, 1921, pp. vi plus 295.

Practical Plainsong. (J. B. Croft's Plainsong Works, No. 41.) By J. B. Croft. The Society of SS. Peter and Paul, London, 1921, pp. 78.

Saint Nicholas. A Plainsong Communion Service. By J. B. Croft. (J. B. Croft's Plainsong Works, No. 12.) The Society of SS. Peter and Paul, London, 1921, pp. 11.

Her Fellows. A Word to Bridesmaids. By Herbert Baylis. The Society of SS. Peter and Paul, Limited, London, 1921, pp. 7.

von Hügel, Baron Friedrich, LL.D., D.D. *Essays and Addresses on the Philosophy of Religion.* New York. Dutton. 1921. pp. xix+308. \$6.00

King, Archdale A. *Holy Unction.* A Dogmatic Treatise on the Unction of the Sick. London. S.S.P.P. 1921. 1/6.

Principles of Church Organization, with special reference to the Church of England in Australia. The Moorhouse Lectures, 1920. By Philip A. Micklem, M.A., Rector of St. James', Sydney. London, S. P. C. K.; New York, Macmillan, 1921.

The Judgment of Nations, or The Ending of Temporal Power. By William Parker. Mt. Lebanon Pub. Co., Pittsburgh, 1921.

Proposed Amendments to the Text of the Psalter. By the Committee on Prayer Book Revision of the Psalter. New York, Macmillan, 1921. 75 cents.

Lives of the Serbian Saints. Translations of Christian Literature, Series VII. By Voyeslav Yanich, D.D., and C. Patrick Hankey, M.A. New York, Macmillan, 1921.

The Spirit of Peace. Sermons by the Bishop of London. Milwaukee, The Morehouse Pub. Co., 1921. \$1.40.

The Vision of Purity. A sermon preached at the Lambeth Conference by the Bishop of London. London, Wells Gardner. 10 cents.

The Life and Growth of Israel. A brief Old Testament history. By Samuel A. B. Mercer, Ph.D., D.D. Milwaukee, Morehouse Pub. Co., 1921. \$1.75.